**The Dissertation Committee for Amy Denise Schreiber certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:**

**The Structural and Thematic Integrity of Diego de San Pedro's Cárcel de Amor**

**Committee:**

_____
**Stanislav Zimic, Supervisor**

_____
**César Salgado**

_____
**Naomi Lindstrom**

_____
**Michael Harney**

_____
**Wayne Rebhorn**

**The Structural and Thematic Integrity of**

**Diego de San Pedro's Cárcel de Amor**

by

**Amy Denise Schreiber, B.S., M.A.**

**Dissertation**

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

the University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

The University of Texas at Austin

December, 2007

# Dedication

In Loving Memory

William L. Humphries

1940-1999

## Acknowledgments

I am sincerely grateful to my dissertation director, Stanislav Zimic, for his endless support and wisdom and for the example that his intellectual curiosity and inspired humanity have provided to me during my time at the University of Texas at Austin. His belief in my value as a scholar has given me the confidence to believe in my ideas.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the other members of my committee for their individual contributions both to this project and my development as a member of the academic community. I would like to thank Prof. César Salgado for inspiring me with his sincere love for his subject matter and for his patience in answering all of my endless questions in class. Prof. Naomi Linstrom has been a model of dedication to excellence in all areas of her professional life and a mentor to me in particular as a woman in our field. I am indebted to Prof. Michael Harney for his willingness to make valuable bibliographical suggestions as I developed my knowledge of fifteenth-century Castilian history. I am grateful to Prof. Wayne Rebhorn for his extremely practical input regarding the future development of this project.

Three fellowships have supported the research for this dissertation: the University of Texas at Austin Continuing Tuition Fellowship, (2004-2005), the Carrie Lee Kennedy Fellowship (2003), and the Oliver William Kennedy Fellowship (2004). I am grateful to the faculty in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese and to the Graduate School for this financial support.

To my many wonderful colleagues, I want to tell you how much I appreciate the many hours of sharing ideas, joys, sorrows and laughs. In particular I would like to acknowledge Anna Pyeatt and Debra Ochoa.

Finally, my family has been a neverending source of encouragement and love. I could not have reached this goal without your support. I can truly share this accomplishment with my husband Larry who has endured this process with unconditional love.

**The Structural and Thematic Integrity of**

**Diego de San Pedro's Cárcel de Amor**

Publication No. _____

Amy Denise Schreiber, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2007

Supervisor: Stanislav Zimic

The sentimental novel Cárcel de Amor by Diego de San Pedro was hugely popular in its time both in Spain and in other parts of Europe, spawning at least twenty editions in Spanish, nine bilingual versions, and eighteen translations between 1492 and 1675. The purpose of this study is to examine the seemingly, and oft criticized, varied nature of the sentimental and political discourse in the novel to demonstrate how San Pedro used them to create unity of structure and theme. In addition I analyze the effects of the author's implementation of metanarrative strategies on the relationship between structure and theme. Cárcel was written during a period of great social and political turmoil in Castile, and San Pedro uses the sentimental and political material of the work to paint a reflection of the society in which he lived. He demonstrates that the chivalric ideals of courtly love and honor based on virtue, values upon which the nobility based their collective identity, are no longer viable in his culture because they have come to be

devoid of the beauty they originally embodied. In their place one finds a growing obsession with honor that is a construction of appearances with little regard for virtue. As the protagonist Leriano, who represents the perfection of these ideals, comes into conflict with the king and other courtiers, the reader realizes that the old ideals and the new reality are completely incompatible. San Pedro also uses several metanarrative strategies to draw the reader into the fictional world in order to force him to confront the same crisis that Leriano and the Auctor character face as they determine that their value system cannot survive in the false, double-dealing society in which they live. He uses these same techniques to underscore the fictional quality of the "reality" that members of that society create for themselves. San Pedro effectively uses both the sentimental and political discourse of the work to create a realistic picture of Castilian society's moral decay in the fifteenth century.

Table of Contents

# Introduction

The sentimental novel Cárcel de Amor by Diego de San Pedro was hugely popular in its time both in Spain and in other parts of Europe. Keith Whinnom refers to the work as a "best-seller" of its era,[1] considering that it spawned at least twenty editions in Spanish, nine bilingual versions, and eighteen translations (Catalan, Italian, French, English, and German) between 1492 and 1675.[2] The popularity of Cárcel invites the modern critic to ponder just why this novel struck a chord with its readers—what was it about the world it portrays that would have spoken to their own experiences during that period of transition from feudalism to the formation of the early modern states in Europe? Was it purely an escapist tale, as much courtly and chivalric literature, or does this work possess a particular relevance for the lives of its Castilian, and later European, readership? This is one of the principal questions that I will seek to answer in this dissertation, but first, in order to facilitate my discussion of the novel, I will provide a synopsis of the plot, a brief biography of San Pedro, and a summary of the most important criticism to date regarding this work.

At the outset of the novel, the Autor is traveling home to Peñafiel when he encounters a savage man, Desire personified, transporting a captive to Love's Prison. The prisoner, Leriano, our protagonist, asks the Autor for assistance. The vision of the savage and the prisoner disappears, and the Autor finds himself alone and lost in the mountains. In the morning, he sees an edifice, which is in fact the prison. The Autor decides to go there and as he reaches the prison, he is confused as to what he sees. He enters and sees Leriano being tormented. Leriano explains the allegory to the Autor and tells him who he is (son of the late Duke Guersio and the Duchess Coleria, of the

kingdom of Macedonia) and why he has been placed in the prison, because of his love for Princess Laureola, daughter of King Gaulo of Macedonia. Leriano begs the Autor to go to her and tell her of his suffering and ask her to remember him with compassion after he has gone. The Autor agrees to help him and travels to Macedonia where, after familiarizing himself with the customs at court, he gains an audience with her. At first, Laureola is offended that the Autor would dare to approach her with such a matter, but after sensing some signs of love in Laureola, he returns to the prison and asks Leriano to write a letter to her, in which he expresses the extent of his suffering and his devotion to her. The Autor goes back to court with Leriano's letter, but Laureola refuses to respond because of the compromising position in which such an action would place her honor. The Autor departs for the prison with the sad news for Leriano. The latter is prepared to die, and as a last request, he gives the Autor one last letter in which he acknowledges the precarious nature of her position and promises that he would never want to compromise her honor. His only request of her before he dies is to receive a letter from her in which she shows compassion for his situation. After some persuasion, she concedes and responds to Leriano with a letter of her own, which she insists is written out of pity, nothing more. The Autor returns to the prison and takes Leriano away with him.

Upon their arrival at court, Laureola and Leriano are discreet but show some outward signs of love for one another. This captures the attention of a rival suitor Persio, whose jealousy causes him to go to her father and tell him that he saw Leriano leaving the princess' quarters during the night. The king orders Persio to challenge Leriano to a duel and sentences his daughter to death for ruining his honor. During their fight, Leriano chops off Persio's hand and is at the point of killing him when, at the prodding of

Persio's family, King Gaulo intervenes and puts an end to their battle. The king, ignoring the outcome of the combat, refuses to acknowledge the victory and continues with his plan to execute his daughter. This occurs as a result of the three other witnesses that Persio finds to corroborate his story. Leriano's initial reaction to this turn of events is to kill Persio and free Laureola from prison. However, the Autor advises him against such a hasty reaction and persuades him to try other remedies. Leriano writes Laureola a letter, in which he tries to calm her fears by telling her not to worry, he will save her. Her response complains of the consequences that her compassion has caused her. The Autor determines not to give this letter to Leriano, and, instead, he sets about formulating a political strategy to free her. This plan includes petitions to the king by the Cardinal, the Queen and Laureola herself. These petitions contain the political discourse of the novel and deal with the qualities of a just king. Gaulo refuses to relent considering his own honor more important than her life and judging that, as a ruler, cruelty takes precedence over clemency. At this point, the Autor approaches Laureola's uncle Galio to ask him to assist them in a rescue attempt of his niece.

Subsequently, the Autor returns to Leriano and delivers Laureola's letter to him. Although her letter emotionally devastates him, he sets about organizing her rescue. Leriano and his men attack the guard at the prison, free Laureola, and deliver her into the protection of her uncle in order to protect her honor. Leriano and his men retreat to his fortress at Susa. In response to this attack, the King and his army lay siege to the fortress. This battle lasts three months, during which time many of Leriano's men are wounded and Leriano himself is injured. However, they do succeed in killing many of King Gaulo's men. After Leriano's troops are reduced to 150, he makes a bold move by

sending 50 men to attack a post where he knows many members of Persio's family are stationed. They are able to capture one of the false witnesses, who confesses rather immediately to the falseness of his previous testimony. In reaction, King Gaulo lifts the siege and executes the three lying witnesses and receives Laureola back at court with great ceremony. Unfortunately for Leriano, the king orders him to stay away until he is able to appease his enemies, namely Persio's family. Thus, Leriano is once again reduced to his former condition of separation from Laureola. The Autor, finding no other way to assuage Leriano's misery, counsels him to write to her. In this letter, Leriano repeats that he is dying for love of her and that he can only be saved through some compassion on her part. He wants to know if she would have him die for her, so that he will know that he is complying with her desires. Laureola's reply states that while she does feel sorry for him, she cannot correspond with him any further out of fear that continuing to do so would only confirm others' suspicions, considering what has just transpired. She acknowledges that she is in his debt for the restoration of her honor, and she offers to repay him in the future, once she is queen, with titles and lands. Her pity for his situation is all that she can currently offer him.

The Autor returns with this letter and confirms that the only thing left for Leriano to do is to die. Leriano thanks the Autor for his faithful service and then retires to his bed, refusing food or drink. One of Leriano's friends Tefeo comes to visit him on his deathbed and proceeds to blame some woman for what is happening to his friend. He lambasts the female sex with many examples of their worthlessness. Leriano responds with a lengthy defense of women that consists of the many reasons why men should be indebted to them.

Duchess Coleria, Leriano's mother, arrives and alarmed at the state in which she finds her son, proceeds with a death lament. This consists of the praise of his many virtues and her protests that due to his noble nature, he has fallen victim to such feelings of love. Immediately before his death, Leriano remembers Laureola's letters, shreds them into pieces and drinks them mixed in a goblet of water. After his death, the Autor gives testimony as to the consistency of his faith/love. Filled with sadness, he returns to Peñafiel, where he currently finds himself, narrating his tale to a "vuestra merced."

Despite the popularity of his works, and in particular Cárcel, very little is known about the life of Diego de San Pedro. Keith Whinnom points out that the difficulty in outlining his literary biography has only been exacerbated by misinformation presented by Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo in 1905, when he confused the author of Cárcel with another writer of the same name in an attempt to correct a previous error in identification, perpetuated by the seventeenth century biographer Nicolás Antonio, who identified San Pedro as a poet of the reign of Juan II (1406-1454).[3] Two possible reasons for the confusion as to San Pedro's identity stem from the common nature of both his given name, Diego, and surname, San Pedro, most particularly the latter. In addition, although most of his biographers accept that he was from Peñafiel, the sacking of that town's archives by the French revolutionary troops at the beginning of the nineteenth century practically destroyed any chance of ascertaining any documental evidence upon which one could build a substantiated portrait of this author (Parrilla xxxix).

One fact we know for certain—Diego de San Pedro worked for the Girón family--because what little information we possess has been gleaned from several references San Pedro made to his service to the Count of Urueña. The first of these statements appears

on the title page of San Pedro's first sentimental romance Tractado de amores de Arnalte y Lucenda, where he refers to himself as "criado del Conde de Urueña" (1: 87). A subsequent allusion to his employer appears in the prologue of his poem *Desprecio de la Fortuna*, which he dedicates to the "Conde de Urueña, su señor" (3: 271). Amid the explanation of the author's reason for dedicating this work to the count, he relates that he feels he truly knows him, "porque quien veinte y nueve años sirviendo comunicó con Vuestra Señoría, no es mucho que conozca enteramente su voluntad" (3: 273). In addition and as mentioned above, in Cárcel the Autor ends his tale with the statement "llegué aquí a Peñafiel, donde quedo besando las manos de vuestra merced" (2: 176). The fortress at Peñafiel, located to the east of Valladolid and south of Burgos, was originally constructed in the fourteenth century by Juan Manuel I, but in the fifteenth century came under control of Pedro Girón, the Grand Master of Calatrava and one of the most powerful men in Castile, under Enrique IV. These statements alone regarding his service to the Count of Urueña do not completely clear up the mystery surrounding San Pedro's identity because the title could refer to either Pedro Girón or his son Juan Téllez-Girón, who inherited the title in 1469. This is significant because according to documentary evidence that Keith Whinnom analyzes in his article "Two San Pedros," multiple Diego de San Pedros served the Girón family in the fifteenth century (256-258). The one who appears in a series of documents which relate to Pedro Girón's business transactions and the guild of hidalgos of Peñafiel dating from 1459 to 1472 is referred to as *teniente*, *bachiller*, and *alcaide* of Peñafiel.[4] The epitaph of his tomb, which unfortunately does not provide a date for his death, describes his service to Pedro Girón but does not mention the successor Juan. It seems that when Menéndez Pelayo heard of

these documents, he assumed they referred to the author of Cárcel, but the dates of composition of his works do not correspond to this Diego de San Pedro being the writer in question.

Whinnom hypothesizes that there must have been a second Diego de San Pedro in the service of the Girón family. He bases his theory on the following: 1.) another Diego de San Pedro is named much lower (56th) in the list of hidalgos of Peñafiel; 2.) the author of Cárcel never refers to himself as a *teniente*, *bachiller* or *alcaide*, which he would have most likely done, had he held those titles; and 3.) the identification of the Count of Urueña, whom he served 29 years, as Juan Téllez-Girón greatly simplifies the issues involved in creating an appropriate chronology of his works when issues raised by their content are taken into consideration.[5] Whinnom concludes this article with the suggestion that these two Diego de San Pedros were uncle and nephew but admits that this is pure speculation. The identification of which Count of Urueña our author served is fundamental to the creation of any kind of literary biography of San Pedro in light of the paucity of documental evidence relating directly to him.

Some familiarity with the life of Don Juan (1456-1528) is not only relevant to the biography of our author, but also supplies some insight into the political and social atmosphere in which he wrote. San Pedro's employer was one of three illegitimate sons of Pedro Girón,[6] as already mentioned, and the nephew of Juan Pacheco, the Grand Master of the Order of Santiago. His father and uncle were two of the most influential figures of the reign of Enrique IV, whom they manipulated ruthlessly for their own benefit. Upon Pedro Girón's death in 1466,[7] Juan's older brother Alfonso inherited the

title of Count of Urueña; however, upon his sibling's early death in 1469, Juan, only 13 years old at the time, received this and other titles left by his father including Lord of Osuña, Piedra, Peñafiel, etc.[8] Influenced by their cousin, Don Diego López Pacheco and other family members, Don Juan, along with his twin brother Rodrigo, initially supported the Beltraneja faction in the War of Succession, but in May of 1476 pledged allegiance to the Isabeline factions at the urging of the Constable of Castile, Pedro Fernández de Velasco, Count of Haro, who would later give his daughter, Leonor de la Vega y Velasco, in marriage to Don Juan. Upon their reconciliation with Isabel, the twins received complete exculpation from the Queen even though they stayed on the outside of the events leading to the conflict's eventual resolution, not granting any assistance to her cause. However, when it came to the war against Granada begun in 1482, the twins participated fully. Rodrigo, who had gained a great reputation for fearlessness, died early on in the conflict at the battle of Loja in 1482. His brother's death seemed to have spurred Don Juan on to dedicate even more men and money to the cause of reconquest. After the fall of Granada in January, 1492, Don Juan, serving as *Notorio Mayor*, accompanied Ferdinand and Isabel as they entered the city. One can assume logically that San Pedro would have been present at these events with Don Juan. His mention in Cárcel of passing through the Sierra Morena on his return to Peñafiel from that year's war leaves little doubt that San Pedro refers to his participation in those actions.[9]

Shortly after the triumphant entry into Granada, Don Juan, by now having spent great sums of money and having lost numerous troops, retired to his estates in Andalusia, where he attempted to re-order his life and, under the influence of his deeply devout wife, began to dedicate himself to great acts of charity to benefit the poor. He did so to such an

extent that he apparently diminished the inheritance he had received from his father's copious fortune by about two-thirds, reducing his financial status among the Spanish grandees to about eleventh (Whinnom, San Pedro 27). Despite his best attempts to live on the margins of the Court and the Monarchy's affairs, Don Juan occasionally was called into military duty[10] or became involved in a court intrigue.[11] However, from 1505 to 1528, Don Juan appears to have retired permanently from such activities. Whinnom believes that San Pedro, following the example of his employer, abandoned the Court to live out his days in relative obscurity and was reduced to rather meager circumstances. He estimates that our author died some time after 1498, the earliest possible date of composition of his poem Desprecio de la Fortuna, but considerably before Don Juan (San Pedro 28).

San Pedro's repertoire of works reveals a striking diversity in literary forms, style and subject matter. Whinnom notes that

> the versatility of Diego de San Pedro is noteworthy even in the fifteenth century, not only for the variety of forms and topics which he was prepared to tackle, but for the chameleon-like way in which he adapted his style and language to the matter in hand or the audience to which it was to be addressed.
>
> Numerous little phrases throughout his works show that he was ever ready to produce what was demanded of him and that he was consumed by an anxiety to please and to ingratiate himself with his superiors. (San Pedro 130)

His first known work La Pasión trovada, (from approximately 1474) as the title suggests, recounts the Passion story beginning with the Agony in the Garden and ending after the Crucifixion and Burial but before the Resurrection. It is comprised of 12 plus 236

stanzas of *quintillas dobles*, groupings of ten octosyllabic verses following the rhyming pattern abaab cdccd (Whinnom, San Pedro 35). Despite the somewhat revolutionary nature of its treatment of the events leading up to the Crucifixion,[12] the poem continued in popularity as a devotional work well into the nineteenth century (Whinnom, San Pedro 44).

San Pedro's first foray into the genre of sentimental fiction produced the Tratado de amores de Arnalte y Lucenda, written in approximately 1481. Structured as a *mîse en abyme*, the forelorn lover recounts to the Author his story of unsuccessful attempts to woo Lucenda, who repeatedly rebuffs his advances. He eventually kills her husband, and upon offering himself as a replacement, she retires to a convent. Arnalte's behavior borders on the ridiculous,[13] and he transgresses against the code of behavior for courtly lovers time and again. He seems to believe that his love for her entitles him to have her feelings correspond to his. It is difficult to say with certainty whether San Pedro intended the novel to portray this type of courtly love in a negative light or perhaps for comic effect, but I believe that one only needs to compare Arnalte to the code for lovers in San Pedro's *Sermón* or to Leriano in Cárcel to accept, at the very least, that it is possible.

*Arnalte* contains two rather lengthy poems, which interrupt somewhat the flow of the narrative and cause some critics to ponder the circumstances of their composition and presence in the novel. Were they drafted previously and placed into the work under a loosely plausible pretext, or were they written specifically for the novel? The first of these poems is a 210 line panegyric dedicated to Queen Isabella, which he includes under the guise of Arnalte's curiosity as to whether she matches her husband's magnificence. Whinnom contends that the poem must have been written about 1480 or 1481 between

the resolution of the War of Succession and the beginning of the military actions against Granada (Whinnom, San Pedro 119). He believes the eulogy, which refers to specific accomplishments of the young queen, was intended to demonstrate to her that the Count of Urueña and his brother were committed to remain her loyal subjects after their initial support of the Beltraneja factions.

With the novel's other poetic composition, Las siete angustias de Nuestra Señora, San Pedro delved into a genre of poetry well-known in medieval writing.[14] Although Whinnom estimates its date of composition as 1480, the poem did not appear in print until 1491 when it appears towards the end of Arnalte under the pretext of serving as a distraction to help the title character's attempts to forget his own sorrows.[15] The Siete angustias is most obviously a reworking of a part of his previous Passion poem in that it shares five of the same Sorrows with eleven *quintillas* and six further half-stanzas taken word for word from the earlier text (Whinnom, San Pedro 37). While one could criticize San Pedro's inclusion of these poems in *Arnalte*, it can also be said that they are structurally symmetrical in their placement and thematically similar as both depict an idealized woman, thus relating to the sentimental genre, even if only loosely (Whinnom, San Pedro 60; Langbehn-Rohland, Zur Interpretation 143).

The Sermón, which I alluded to earlier, was composed sometime in the 1480's after the completion of Arnalte, at the behest of some ladies of the court. In Cárcel's introduction we discover that he refers in particular to having created the piece for Doña Marina Manuel. The treatise is an *ars amatoria*, or guide for lovers' behavior, which was fairly commonplace during the Middle Ages both in Latin and the vernacular languages. And, like most of the other works in the genre, the Sermón describes the *artes de honeste*

*amandi*, meaning that it does not instruct one as to how to achieve sexual conquests but rather guides the behavior of the ideal courtly lover (Whinnom, San Pedro 90-91). San Pedro's treatment of the subject matter is rather clever in that he places his advice in a perfectly structured sermon based on a farcical text, the Gospel of St. Infatuation. It is divided into three sections: a set of rules for the male lover, a list of consoling thoughts for the lovelorn, and general counsel for how the ladies should treat their admirers. While it may seem somewhat sacrilegious to treat such a topic in a format generally reserved for more spiritual subjects, the melding of the sacred and the profane and the blending of the imagery associated with the adorations of the Virgin in religious writings and the worship of a particular lady in courtly literature were extremely common in the medieval world. Beyond the intrinsic value of the Sermón, it is important to a discussion of Cárcel because in it San Pedro creates a model of the ideal lover with which we may compare Leriano.

The last of our author's major works is the poem Desprecio de la Fortuna, probably composed in the late 1490's during the period of his employer's retirement which we previously discussed. The 210 line text succinctly presents Boethius' thinking regarding life's suffering from his De consolatione Philosophiae: one should be content with one's situation in life because all unhappiness is a result of man's sin—namely, Avarice, Envy, Lust, Vainglory and Pride (Whinnom, San Pedro 127-129). Beyond the principal works highlighted here, San Pedro is also responsible for a group of minor love poems which began to appear in print in the Cancionero general of 1511. If we are to believe San Pedro's condemnation of such frivolous writings in the *Desprecio*, we can assume that they pertain chronologically to the period between 1480 and 1492,

corresponding to the production of both Arnalte and Cárcel, when he was writing primarily to amuse the Isabeline court (Whinnom, San Pedro 121). Although not generally highly regarded, the poems display a marked variety in form: *canciones*, *esparsas*, *romances*, *villancicos*, short *invenciones* and much longer pieces in stanzas (Whinnom, San Pedro 122). Some employ relatively simply lexicon and syntax while others are extremely obfuscatory, so much so that Gracián singled out one of San Pedro's *canciones* as "the most extraordinary example of paradox and concentrated wit that he knew of."[16] Both San Pedro's major works and lesser known poetry display his diversity of style, his willingness to experiment and his desire to mold his writings to the tastes and whims of his primary reading public, the upper nobility of late fifteenth century Castile.

It is quite likely that our author's awareness of the literary fashions of the time is the reason for the editorial success of many of his works, but especially Cárcel. Early literary critics disparaged the novel much as they would many other genres of current popular fiction. In particular, they maligned it for its lack of coherence and the disparity of its elements, criticizing the work for containing "wearisome descriptions,"[17] and for being "poco artísticamente trabado" (Northrup 157; Hurtado and Serna 204). George Ticknor states that "there is no skill in the construction of the fable, and the whole work only shows how little romantic fiction was advanced in the time of Ferdinand and Isabella" (449). Similarly Gustave Reynier faults the novel for comprising "beaucoup d'éléments divers, d'ailleurs assez maladroitament associés" (62). Although these critics were writing in the first half of the twentieth century, some more recent negative opinions still prevail about the novel. For example, Pamela Waley criticizes San Pedro for his "failure to reconcile the courtly and the chivalresque elements in this story," which in her

opinion “illustrates how little San Pedro was bothered by coherence and consistency in the structure of his novel” (263). Similarly, Barbara Kurtz maligns the plot for being “slight, a stereotyped intrigue from the common stock of the contemporaneous European literature of love,” and “minimal, hackneyed” (“Diego,” 125). In general, later criticism has explored Cárcel’s social implications, the various elements that comprise its structure, and the conflictive nature of its social codes.

I will begin with criticism that deals more indirectly with my primary concerns. The allegory with which the narration begins has been of interest to critics for two reasons: first, because it provides a unity of structure to the novel, and second, because it performs certain important functions in the work. The allegory as a unifying strategy has been noted by Bruce Wardropper: “The novel, starting from an obvious allegory interpreted in all its details, passes on to an allegory none the less real for being less obvious. [. . .] The Cárcel de Amor, as its title suggests, is a story about the spiritual servitude and torture of the lover. This allegory is never lost sight of, from beginning to end of the novel.” He continues: "The allegory in the vision dissipates so that when Laureola in turn is imprisoned it is a real prison. Allegory has turned subtly into reality.”[18] The prison motif provides unity of structure in that as Leriano is freed from his allegorical prison, Laureola almost immediately finds herself in an actual one despite her innocence. This raises an interesting question as to why each of these characters’ freedom/happiness cannot exist simultaneously.

One of the functions that the allegory serves is the creation of a certain tone that its placement at the beginning of the novel lends to the work as a whole. E. Michael Gerli points out that “the primary action of his tale is emotion” related through “such

technical devices as allegory," which "seeks first to be lyrical and then narrative, to create mood and sympathy before explaining or fully elaborating the events which are the origins of those feelings" ("Towards," 475). Whinnom agrees: "The very fact that it opens with an allegorical introduction was an indication that this was to be an artistic, solemn, and uplifting work" (San Pedro 105). Whinnom also believes that San Pedro blurs the boundaries between allegory and reality, which gives "the whole romance something of the quality of a dream (some might say a nightmare), and that in his at once real and unreal Macedonia setting he is free to tell his extraordinary idealized story without allowing mundane detail or further objection to intrude" (San Pedro 106). One other important function of the allegory that Whinnom notes is that it provides "a concrete model of a psychological theory of love and at the same time a series of statements justifying passion and an implicit set of rules for the constant lover's conduct. Without writing another treatise or sermon on the subject, San Pedro has conveyed his ideas through a plastic, symbolic representation of them" (San Pedro 105).

A third function of the allegory that critics have suggested relates to its ability to sublimate the sacred and the profane. Barbara Kurtz has done the most work on this subject. She proffers the idea that while some critics have assumed that the Spanish use of allegory in the Middle Ages is a direct descendent of French courtly literature, the truth of the matter, according to Kurtz, is that a more direct relationship exists between San Pedro's allegorical prison and edifices found in the theological writings of the Christian Middle Ages. Kurtz maintains that San Pedro's allegorical edifice possesses certain specific similarities with the religious treatments of the same motif and that he creates these similarities in order "to exploit just such an ironic interplay of spiritual and

erotic meanings, and this subtext of association reinforces the probability that San Pedro looked for inspiration in the spiritual and religious background of the allegorical edifice, and the possibilities it afforded for ironic allusiveness" ("Allegorical Edifice," 137). Kurtz believes that San Pedro would choose such an image because of

> its association with the human soul and its fate, both psychological and moral; its consequent appropriateness as a place of or bastion against moral and/or psychological travails; and its connection, especially in those treatments centered on the Virgin, with the rhetoric of praise. These three strands of the historical Christian use of the allegorical edifice--the psychological, the moral, and the laudatory--probably do much to explain the continuing appeal of the image to writers such as San Pedro who employed it in the exposition of the multi-faceted experience of love. ("Castle," 42-43)

Other critics have noted this confluence of the sacred and profane in Cárcel, particularly in the deathbed scene, in which Leriano consumes the cup containing Laureola's shredded letters and, before dying, utters these final words: "Acabados son mis males" (II: 176). One of these critics is Joseph F. Chorpenning, who appears to take two very different views of the implications of this final scene. In "Leriano's Consumption of Laureola's Letters in the Cárcel de Amor," he traces the letter ingestion back to several Old Testament stories, which seem to have some correlation to the particulars of the novel. He believes that the positive nature of the tales to which San Pedro alludes gives Leriano's consumption of these letters a similar feeling. Specifically, Chorpenning believes that it supports his theory that San Pedro's theme is pro-feminist because he consumes these letters, confirming that Laureola's honor is more important

than Leriano's life ("Leriano's," 442-445). It is a rather complicated argument, which would be convincing except for the relevant objections that E. Michael Gerli raises in response to it. In particular, Gerli points out that "it is doubtful that San Pedro's audience would have recognized the obscure Biblical events adduced by Chorpenning" ("Leriano's," 415). Instead, Gerli believes that San Pedro was following specific instructions for dying, contained in the *Ars Moriendi* texts, which were quite popular in the Late Middle Ages among the aristocracy. These texts described the proper spiritual and psychological process that one must follow, which included the taking of communion. He states:

> In Cárcel de Amor, Leriano's libation is nothing less that an evocation of the *Viaticum*, and the shredding of the letters an allusion to the ritual fragmentation of the host into the communion chalice. San Pedro in this image is cleverly distending the *cancionero* conceit on the divinity of the beloved and irreverently affirming Leriano's steadfast belief in Laureola's ability to redeem him spiritually. (416)

The two critics' conclusions are the same, however, in that both believe that the scene lends a positive bent towards San Pedro's treatment of his protagonist. Still, other critics have seen this image, as well as others contained in the novel, as being sacrilegious.[19] Thus, they assert that this paints Leriano in a negative light for confusing his feelings of love with a religious belief, much as Calixto does in La Celestina. These ideas will be relevant to my discussion regarding San Pedro's attitude towards his protagonists.

Another area of analysis that has been of great interest to critics is the search for possible sources of the Cárcel. The most obvious, of course, is San Pedro's Sermón,

which numerous critics have analyzed to either prove or disprove whether they believe San Pedro portrays Leriano and Laureola as perfect courtly lovers or not. Outside of San Pedro's own work, several possible sources have been noted. Pamela Waley suggests that San Pedro's sentimental novels are descendants of the poetic *cancionero* tradition rather than a narrative tradition. She contends that "the inspiration, the ideas, the motives and the expression … as well as the conception of love that dominates [them], derive principally from the same sources as the poetry of the *cancioneros*, with which it has more in common than with already existing forms of fiction" (253). Gerli takes her theory even further, stating that "Cárcel de Amor and the greater portion of late fifteenth-century Castilian love literature written in prose rely heavily on the narrative literalization of *cancionero* metaphors."[20] In this same article Gerli changes gears to discuss the relationship that the idea and plot of Cárcel have with Boccaccio's tale of Guiscardus and Ghismonda in the Decameron IV, 1. The similarities that he notes include an impossible, secret love between people of different social classes, the inclusion of a cruel father, and the anthropophagous consumptions of the lovers as they die, which in Boccaccio's story is literal (Guiscardus' heart), but in San Pedro's is figurative (letters) (417-418). While I agree that one could draw certain similarities between the two works, I judge Gerli's evidence as inconclusive, beyond the obvious influence of Boccaccio on Spanish medieval writers in general.

Nicholas G. Round has contributed a very important study entitled "The Presence of Mosén Diego de Valera in Cárcel de Amor." In this work, he discusses the significance of Diego de San Pedro's reliance on Valera's Tratado en defensa de virtuosas mujeres in his formulation of Leriano's deathbed defense of women.[21] Round

discusses the various points of contact between the two contemporary authors and suggests that San Pedro quite possibly admired Valera as a fellow *converso* with whom he shared literary as well as political and social interests. Most interesting in this article is the analysis of how San Pedro systematically tailored Valera's Tratado to fit his own tastes and aims. I think that the connections between these two fifteenth-century Castilian authors could possibly be even more numerous than those that Round's study details. A comparison of the larger bodies of work of both authors could reveal the profound influence of Valera on San Pedro, but does not fit within the scope of this project.

E. Von Richthofen has drawn other interesting parallels between the Cárcel and Petrarch, Dante and Andreas Capaellanus. He proposes that the picture of Laureola's steadfast denial of Leriano is based on Petrarch's description of Laura, and that Leriano's stoic acceptance of his fate derives from Petrarch's own resignation, faced without any hope of having his love for Laura reciprocated (30). The influence of Dante is similar, in that Von Richthofen maintains that the image of the savage man carrying a stone statue of a beautiful woman from which light emits is an allusion to a collection of "poemas herméticos dirigidos por Dante a una mujer que tenía un corazón de piedra" (32-33). Finally, Von Richthofen gives a thorough analysis of exactly in what ways San Pedro's conception of courtly love is indebted to Andreas Capellanus' De Amore Libri Tres. These analogies have been assumed by many critics as obvious, due to Capellanus' importance in the development of the concept of courtly love and the systemization of its principles, but Von Richthofen gives specific examples of the characteristics in the *De Amore Libri Tres* that can be found in Cárcel (33-36).

I have mentioned these possible sources of the Cárcel to show the varied interests of critics in their approaches to the novel. I agree with Gerli's opinion that although:

> Cárcel de amor has been more than adequately examined from the perspective of rhetoric and Castilian sentimental literature, one thing remains clear from our brief investigation: the need for a comprehensive inquiry into the sources of its plot and imagery. Once these have been thoroughly identified, then we can proceed to a wide ranging inquiry into the reasons and methods underlying their adaptation and perhaps come to a fuller understanding of the meaning of this complex, strangely beautiful and difficult work. ("Leriano's," 418)

Next, I will turn my attention to the studies that draw comparisons between the Cárcel de Amor and other contemporary fiction. First, I begin with the analyses of the differences between Cárcel and San Pedro's earlier sentimental novel, Arnalte y Lucenda. Most critics generally agree with Dorothy Severin that "the Cárcel de Amor represents a structural advance on the Tractado de Amores de Arnalte y Lucenda" ("Structure,"165). Severin bases this judgment on her opinion that "Diego de San Pedro's second sentimental romance is meticulously planned, so that the components of the whole are carefully structured and balanced " in contrast to his previous novel whose "internal structure falls only very loosely into units best defined as 'exchange of letters' and 'meetings'" (168). Whinnom explains in what sense San Pedro's second novel improves upon its predecessor:

> He has raised the social level of the setting; his hero is a perfect courtier and irreproachable lover, the constancy and perfection of whose love is demonstrated by his martyrdom; his heroine is a perfect lady, compounded of compassion and

concern for her honor; he has contrived to cast over the whole work an air of archetypal simplicity; the story is not marred by irrelevant or discordant digression; the plotting is in general tauter, more complex, and more plausible; an extraordinary variety of *praeexercitamenta* (the set pieces) contribute to an extraordinarily unified whole; and the style is subtle, solemn and rich. San Pedro has achieved a kind of perfection. (San Pedro 116-117)

In addition, Whinnom makes the distinction between San Pedro's rhetorical styles in each novel:

> The difference between the rhetoric of Arnalte and Lucenda and the rhetoric of Prison of Love is the difference between medieval and Renaissance humanist rhetoric. Devices which the classical rhetoricians had advised must be used very sparingly, and examples which were held up as horrible warnings rather than as models for imitation, found their way into medieval manuals without qualification, and were enthusiastically adopted by medieval writers. [. . .] Italian and Italian-trained scholars like Nebrija deplored the attempt to imitate the syntax of Latin in language which was not Latin and lacked its resources. The phrase "good taste" (buen gusto) originated at the court of Isabella, and though vague enough to admit various interpretations, always signified a certain dignity and moderation. That San Pedro was not merely responding to such a generalized expression of taste, but restudying his rhetoric in some humanist manual, seems indicated by his use in Prison of Love of a whole category of rhetorical devices which are not to be found in Arnalte and Lucenda and which the medieval theorists show little interest in, namely the techniques of *abbreviatio*.[22]

Later, I will return to the rhetorical nature of the novel and the criticism regarding the function it serves in Cárcel.

Pamela Waley has written several articles that study Cárcel in the context of other contemporary Spanish sentimental romances.[23] In her comparisons between San Pedro's and Juan de Flores' works, she contrasts the literary tradition from which the novels stem and each author's conception of love. As previously stated, Waley maintains that San Pedro's main influence is the love poetry of the *cancionero* tradition, which is "concerned with the idealized conception of love that belongs to the realm of poetry; those of Juan de Flores derive largely from the fiction of Boccaccio, and in the main discuss love as observed behavior between men and women" ("Love," 263). Flores' Torrellas in Grisel and Mirabella demonstrates a

> forthright skepticism on the subject of feminine virtue [which] is in total contrast with the perfunctory and hypothetical idealization of women uttered by Leriano on his deathbed. The idea of women conveyed by Flores through his Torrellas is not compatible with the attitudes of courtly love or any other kind of idealizing affection. The love game of the troubadour is replaced by one much more in the spirit of Ovid's Ars amatoria. (Waley, "Love," 266)

Waley's discussion of the different concepts of love in these works is illuminating and merits further investigation.

One final work that has often been compared to Cárcel is La Celestina. Obvious similarities are the possible *converso* origins of the authors, the protagonists' vision of love as their religion, the tragic endings and the parents' laments. It is this final similarity that has drawn the interest of multiple critics. Severin offers a clear explanation of the

structure of Leriano's mother's lament at the end of Cárcel, showing how it follows the typical format of the *planctus*, a rhetorical device San Pedro uses both in his poetry and prose. In Cárcel, Severin notes that San Pedro realistically creates a lament that actually follows the grief patterns suggested by modern psychology: "shock, anger, bargaining, grief and acceptance" ("From the Lamentation," 179). In contrast, Pleberio's lament in the Celestina follows the same pattern except for the acceptance. She states: "[I]nstead of reaching a state of acceptance, Pleberio seems to regress at the end of the lament into shock, incoherence and anger" (183). Severin believes that "San Pedro would suggest that acceptance should be the final note of a *planctus*, [but] Rojas is a writer who often employs a commonplace to destroy a commonplace" (183). She would seem to be stating that Rojas was denying the "acceptance" as a necessary step in the grief process. Luis Miguel Vicente takes her argument a step further, and by doing so, I believe, actually explains the difference between the two laments better. According to Vicente, the elegy and the acceptance that Leriano's mother expresses in her lament indicate that Leriano's death is an honorable one that is meant to serve "a su dama fielmente y sin manchar ni su propia fama ni la de Laureola" (36). Leriano's mother also seems to be consoled by the knowledge of the transcendence of this life. He has lived an honorable life of virtue and service, and his death (although it would appear to be a suicide) is really a self-sacrifice according to her. In contrast, Pleberio's lament lacks praise and the consolation. Vicente points this out to suggest that Pleberio has no room for hope in Melibea's death because it represents:

> la plasmación del mundo con toda su compleja maraña de relaciones humanas egoístas movidas por la *cupiditas* denostada por los Santos Padres, ora en su

> faceta libidinosa, ora como codicia de dinero o bienes temporales: los amantes encarnando la cara lasciva de la *cupiditas*; Celestina, sus pupilas, y los criados de Calisto con ambos tipos de codicia sexual y material; y los padres de Melibea, en el otro extremo, preocupados en su prosperidad material (codicia de bienes temporales). Son todos servidores del mundo. (40)

Vicente's contrast of the two laments is a firm defense against the criticism of Leriano's suicide, which some scholars have used to justify a negative view of him as a character, on the grounds that killing oneself is a mortal sin, according to Catholic dogma.

I shall now turn my attention to various critical attempts to explain the structure of the Cárcel de Amor. In my discussion of the allegory in the novel, I have already mentioned several works that point to the prison motif as a unifying structural concept. Still others, including Whinnom, Chorpenning and Sol Miguel-Prendes[24] have elaborated on the intricate rhetorical structure of the novel and have suggested various theories in an attempt to explain the work's design. Chorpenning describes "the composition of the Cárcel . . . as a mosaic made up of different rhetorical forms, e.g. letters, discourses, challenges, harangues, laments, etc., which San Pedro arranged" into chapters "conceived according to the manuals of rhetoric" ("Rhetoric," 1). Chorpenning judges the traditional function of rhetoric to be the following:

> From Antiquity to the beginnings of Romanticism, under all teachings about the art of verbal expression there lies the more or less dominant supposition that the paradigm of all expression is the oration. Even though humanism stressed written rather than oral performance, Renaissance narrative is, paradoxically, an imitation of the formal oration. It is a literary 'counterfeit' oration. The aim of a rhetorical

> education was to get its students to take a stand, as an orator might, and defend it, or to attach the position of others. To this end, the characters of the narrative were manipulated to achieve the goal of persuading the reader / listener to a particular point of view. (1)

Chorpenning explains the structure of the work according to the rhetorical rules for an oration whose purpose was to defend the value of women. He states:

> In fifteenth-century Spain, the feminist debate was still a heated one, and San Pedro wished to make clear his position on the question. To do this he had recourse to rhetoric, from which he learned the art of verbal expression, and how to take a position and defend it, and to courtly love, which from its origins held woman in high esteem, placing her at the top of the feudal hierarchy of love and teaching that to be in her service was an ennobling and uplifting experience. (6)

I agree with Chorpenning's analysis of the organization of the novel, but I think that his estimation of the theme of Cárcel, that San Pedro wants to show high esteem for women, is only part of the larger theme of the novel.

In an interesting counterpoint to his first article, Chorpenning reanalyzes the novel using Northrop Frye's theories on romance in which he outlines four possible "narrative movements," one of these being the descent into hell.[25] Leriano's initial prison was a result of his captivity by the god of Love, whose domain is "tyranny, bondage, oppression, torture, despair and death" ("Loss," 346). Chorpenning believes that Leriano's final hell is a result of his suicide, a direct outcome of "the sentimental inferno created by selfish passion: excruciating pain, despair, death and damnation" ("Loss," 351). In his earlier work, Chorpenning finds that love has an uplifting, restorative power,

but in his second analysis, Leriano is a selfish and self-absorbed creature, condemned by the inferno of his own emotions. I find these two distinctly differing viewpoints very interesting and am curious as to what caused this critic's about-face.

Although much of the criticism I have described here is valuable and convincing, what seems to be lacking is an attempt to reconcile the seemingly disparate elements of Cárcel's structure as a whole in order to explore the theme of the work. To accomplish this task I will follow the thematic-structural approach that stems from Alexander A. Parker's seminal article "An Approach to the Spanish Drama of the Golden Age" as a guide. There are several aspects of Parker's approach that are essential to this study. First, and most important, is the idea that although an author may not seek to portray "a series of complete characters," he does hope to provide "a complete action." Parker supports this claim with the following explanation:

> By a complete action I do not only mean one that hangs together, that ties up all the loose strands, I mean an action that is a significant whole, one that discloses a theme that has a significant bearing on experience, a theme that can be taken out of the particular action and universalized in the form of an important judgment on some aspect of human life. I want to insist upon this distinction between action and theme because it is fundamental. The action is what the incidents of the plot are in themselves, the theme is what these incidents mean. [. . .] The relation of theme to action has nothing whatsoever to do with the degree of verisimilitude in the latter, but depends entirely upon analogy. The plot of a play is merely an invented situation, and as such a kind of metaphor since its contact with reality is not that of literal representation but analogical correspondence; the theme of a

> play is the human truth expressed metaphorically by the stage fiction. [. . .] Here the normal criterion of unity of action must be replaced by that of unity of theme, and it is in this way that the apparent duality of many Spanish plays is resolved. I refer to those that have two plots, a main plot and a subplot with different actions or with different dramatic tone. The relation of the one plot to the other must be looked for in the relation of each to the theme.[26]

At its core this methodology harkens back to the dramatic theory of Aristotle's Poetics because of its emphasis of plot over character: "Plot, then, is the first principle and, as it were, soul of tragedy, while character is secondary."[27]

While Parker's comments were originally intended for an analysis of Spanish Golden Age drama, he applied a similar approach in his study of the picaresque tradition in Spain and Europe, consistently emphasizing aspects of these novels' structure to show their thematic unity, in an attempt to defend against their disparagement at the hands of literary historians who devalued the Spanish picaresque in particular for lacking "unified plots," "lifelike characterizations," and "detached and accurate observations" (Literature 8). I believe his technique is appropriate for a discussion of this work due to the novel's variety of elements including allegory, highly rhetorical expressions of courtly love in the protagonists' letters, political discourse addressed to the king, a chivalric episode complete with a duel and other battles, and a deathbed defense of women, all of which have perplexed (and at times offended) critics for their lack of unity. I propose that by using Parker's method of studying the structure of a work, I can arrive at a conclusion of its theme based on an analysis of how these various elements support a central metaphor, or the theme of the text. Specifically, I find that through the counterpoint of love versus

honor, the use of political discourse and the portrayal of the author's journey through the novel, Diego de San Pedro creates a simulacrum of the current political and social situation in Castile. This serves as a warning to his readership of the possible consequences of the perpetuation of the disparity between the value systems of chivalry upon which they purportedly base their moral system and the reality of their actions. The idealism that the protagonist Leriano embodies cannot function in a society that only honors his values in words but not deeds, and thus, he dies in the end. In this dissertation, I will demonstrate how the counterpoint of love and honor, the use of political discourse and the particularly metafictional narrative choices of San Pedro all combine to support this theme.

In chapter one I will provide a historical summary of the political and social climate of the Trastamaran dynasty, beginning with Enrique's overthrow of his half brother Pedro I and ending with the reign of the Catholic Monarchs. This period of great turmoil represents a little more than a century of rapid moral decay in Castile. Chapter two will analyze the incompatibility between the ideal of courtly love and the Spanish concept of honor. Previous criticism, most notably that of Bruce Wardropper, has made the apparent confrontation between the two codes quite clear. Leriano represents the code of love and thus allows himself to be guided by his feelings ("El mundo," 192). Laureola and her father, on the other hand, represent the code of honor, which in the end triumphs over love. The outcome is inevitable: "Opuesto al amor cortesano, el honor lleva, sin titubeo, a la tragedia. Victoria del amor a expensas del honor o victoria del honor a expensas del amor." Wardropper shows how the novel materializes the conflict between the two codes, a topic that he describes as "perfecto tema para la tragedia,"

which "los dramaturgos españoles supieron explotar maravillosament" ("El mundo, 189). Other critics have acknowledged the incompatibility of love and honor, but in general have sought to place blame on either of the two protagonists or the *Autor* (I will deal with this issue separately) for the outcome of the novel.[28] That their love is impossible, is not due to their own conduct, but rather is a result of the cynicism of the society in which they live. The society in which they live is one that judges a person's honor not on his or her own character but rather the perceptions, paranoia and lies of those around them. The development of this theme in Cárcel is important to Spanish literary history because it serves as a decisive step in the progression of the Spanish concept of honor. From the earliest days of Spanish literature the theme of honor emerges in the Poema del Mio Cid, and the concept continues to develop until it reaches its maximum expression in the honor plays of the seventeenth century. The study of the concept of honor in this work is vital in an analysis of the development of this Spanish obsession.

In chapter three I will analyze the inclusion of political discourse in the middle of a sentimental novel like Cárcel. Its presence has drawn the attention of several critics who have attempted to explain its function as a criticism of the Inquisition, as a tool of propaganda to legitimize the aristocracy, or as the representation of political tyranny that mirrors the power of both love and honor over the protagonists (Márquez Villanueva 93; Weissberger 308-309; Tejerina-Canal 51). These different views of the political discourse in the novel will be helpful in my discussion of its importance in supporting San Pedro's theme. I believe that San Pedro was using the format of the sentimental novel to demonstrate the identity crisis of the nobility during this important moment of transition as the Catholic Monarchs were centralizing their power. The novel brings to

light that the idealism upon which they had long based their world view was no longer viable in the real world as their actions revealed the disparity between their supposed value system and their deeds.

Finally, one of the most intriguing marks of the Cárcel is the role of the author as a character in the novel. James Mandrell notes:

> Despite recent critical discussion, the narrator remains a troublesome figure. The ambiguities engendered by El Autor's presence as a character, by his function as the narrator, and by his name continue to render him singularly problematic, utterly unlike any other character in Cárcel *de Amor*, or, for that matter, any other in early peninsular literature. (99)

Some critics have sought to explain the presence of the Autor character as a matter of practicality,[29] while others have suggested more profound reasons for his participation, such as the novel's autobiographical nature, its portrayal of a reader of texts, or its display of the power inherent to authorship (Wardropper, "Allegory," 44; Voigt 24; Dunn 198). These critics have tiptoed around the issue employing current metafictional theory to analyze the presence of the author as character in Cárcel de Amor. However, Michael Gerli has noted that "from its outset the Spanish sentimental romance reveals a preoccupation with articulating in a concerted fashion one of the most essential qualities of all narrative--the question of the nature of narrative itself" ("Metafiction," 57). In this article Gerli includes Cárcel in his analysis, but his only conclusion is that San Pedro "constructed a metaphor through which he clearly poses fundamental questions about the limits of fiction and the role authors play in creating illusions" ("Metafiction," 59). As Gerli's analysis is limited in scope, I believe that there remains much work to be done in

this area. I think that San Pedro's intention is yet unclear. Chapter four of this dissertation will study past and current literary metafictional theory in an attempt to inform my investigation of the possible relation of the author-character to the text's larger metaphor.

The body of criticism on the Cárcel de Amor is varied in its depth, topics, credibility and pertinence. I believe that this is to be expected from such an intriguing novel, whose variety of elements has engendered great interest among medieval and Renaissance specialists. Unfortunately, the novel is very little known outside of these specialists and, for this reason, has not been sufficiently credited for the fundamental role that it plays in Spanish literary history regarding the development of certain themes (i.e., The concept of honor typical of Spanish Golden Age theater) and the approximation of this particular sentimental romance towards the inception of the novel that so many critics attribute to Don Quixote. This introduction has sought to show the most important past and current scholarship relating to Cárcel as well as to outline my theoretical approach and the structure of this dissertation.

## Chapter One – Historical Background

As the majority of this dissertation seeks to explain Cárcel de Amor in its social and political context, a description of the history of Castile in the fifteenth century is fundamental. This time period marks one of the most important in Spanish history because many of the elements that comprise it are essential to understanding what and who Spain would come to be in the following centuries. Namely, these would be the struggle of the monarchy, from Juan II to the Catholic Monarchs, to consolidate its power against the wily Castilian nobility, the constant struggle of the *conversos* to find their place in society, and the path that led to the creation of the Inquisition. The political turmoil that I will describe in this chapter did not only affect the upper echelons of Castilian society. Especially during the rule of Enrique IV, chaos reigned throughout the land, and the arrival of Isabel and Ferdinand, with their firm hand of justice, provided a welcome respite from the seeming lawlessness that had prevailed previously. Obviously, the marriage of Isabel and Ferdinand also had the effect of uniting two kingdoms and thus the creating of a nation, which, although it may not have been perceived as such at the time, is, in the end, one of the lasting effects of their union. The situation of the *conversos* in the peninsula was precarious at best, and I will try to clarify the many factors that are encompassed in their situation. I believe that this "problem" as well as the creation and practices of the Inquisition are one of the most singularly important influences in the development of the Spanish psyche of the late fifteenth century and those to follow, especially as they relate to the obsessive paranoia with personal and family honor and the subsequent secrecy required to maintain it. This chapter seeks to outline these topics in order to place Cárcel in its proper socio-historic context.

The two principal conflicts taking place in this time period are the struggles of the *conversos* and the long-running chess match between the monarchy and the nobility to gain power over the realm. It would be impossible to discuss one of these issues in a vacuum, free from the other, because of the interrelated nature of these two problems. This is a result of both the monarchy's and the nobility's duplicity in their dealings with the *conversos*. On the one hand, the converts served as physicians, secretaries and important advisors to all of the kings and nobles; however, both were completely capable of dealing the "*converso* card" when it suited their interests. One early example of this takes place during the rule of Pedro I of Castile, infamously known as Pedro el Cruel. From the very outset of his tumultuous reign, the sagacious Don Samuel ha-Levi served Pedro as *Tesorero Mayor* of the realm. Don Samuel soon became one of Pedro's favorites and gained a seat on the Royal Council. Benzion Netanyahu describes him as "one of the foremost courtiers the Jews of Christian Spain ever had. Only Joseph de Écija and Abraham el Barchilon possibly matched him in influence. Both his rapid rise to honor and power and his tragic fate after ten years of service cast their shadow on the period of transition which ended with the catastrophe of 1391."[30] About the time that Don Samuel achieved his position of power, Spain was "still smarting from the afflictions of the plague, and popular hostility to the Jews was rising in both Castile and Aragon. To be sure, in 1350 Spain did not permit such atrocities against the Jews as those perpetrated in Savoy, Switzerland and Germany during the Black Death" (Netanyahu 94). This did not mean, however, that no animosity existed in the Peninsula. Evidence of this can be found in the petitions presented by the cities to the Cortes of 1351 (Valladolid), in which they "demanded that the Jews be segregated, live in separate boroughs, and be marked off

as inferior both in appearance and in civil rights. Thus, they asked the King that Jews be forbidden to use Christian names, wear precious clothes, and engage Christian nurses for their infants" (Netanyahu 95). At the same time the cities made these requests, they also audaciously asked the King to reinstate the Jews' right to usury, when just three years before, during the Cortes of 1348 (Alcalá), they had finally succeeded in having it outlawed. The cities' only reason in pursuing such a course of action was their desperate need of loans to aid in their recovery from the recent plague. In addition, they asked that the King revoke the Jews' rights to own property, which had been granted to them at the same time the right to usury was abolished, three years earlier. The cities received no satisfaction from Pedro, and "indubitably, the cities saw a Jewish influence in the King's unsatisfactory response to their petition, as well as in his refusal to grant the moratorium they requested on debts owed by Christians to Jews. That Don Samuel was believed to have inspired these answers may be taken for granted" (Netanyahu 96).

At the same time, Pedro's half-brother, Enrique de Trastámara, was beginning to plot to destroy Pedro. He saw in the King's pro-Jewish attitude an opportunity to gain popular support for his own claims to the throne. Don Enrique began by attempting to gain control over Toledo in 1355. One of his first acts there was to attack the smaller of the *juderías*, which was essentially unfortified. In Pedro López de Ayala's description of the attack, one notes that Enrique does not personally participate in the raid:

> E el conde e el maestre, desque entraron en la cibdad, asosegaron en sus posadas; pero las unas compañas comenzaron a robar una judería apartada que dicen el Alcana, e robáronla, e mataron los judíos que fallaron fasta mil e docientas personas, omes e mujeres, grandes e pequeños. Pero la judería mayor non la

> pudieron tomar, que estaba cercada, e avía mucha gente dentro: e algunos caballeros que tenían ya la partida del rey ayudaban a los judíos, e todos en uno defendían la judería mayor. (146)

According to Netanyahu, this aggression against the Jews was intended to shore up support for Enrique from the Christians living in Toledo, who were already brimming over with animosity for the Jews living amongst them. Although he realized the importance of this move regarding the situation in Toledo specifically, Enrique understood that these actions would reveal to all Castilians where he stood regarding the Jewish issue, which in turn could garner him the support of those who harbored hatred against the Jews (98). Enrique's initial attempts at controlling Toledo failed, and although he was forced to retreat, the lasting effect of this first effort was notable. Despite this seeming failure in Toledo, Enrique won the public relations battle by associating his political aspirations to the throne with the anti-Jewish movement, thus drawing to his side the most violent of the anti-Semites, which came primarily from the lower classes in the city centers. Subsequently, in cities where the nobility were also backing Enrique's cause, the masses felt empowered to plot their own attacks against the Jews (Netanyahu 100).

After one such pogrom in Miranda de Ebro in 1360, in which the citizens of the town robbed and killed their Jewish neighbors, Pedro felt it was his duty to see that justice was served and that those who had perpetrated these crimes against Castilian Jews be punished. Pedro ordered the execution of at least five citizens of Miranda de Ebro, "one of whom he ordered to be boiled and another to be roasted in his presence." Netanyahu believes that "these gruesome punishments curbed the pogromist movement

(for the time being), but they increased the people's hatred of Pedro and augmented Enrique's following" (103). Pedro, as the monarchs before him had done, felt the need to protect his Jewish vassals from these acts of violence committed against them just as he would have if they were Christians. Enrique realized that by purposefully creating scenarios in which the King would be forced to come to the Jews' defense, he was sowing the seeds of hostility towards the king and his perceived pro-Jewish policies. Of course, it did not help that Pedro's swift and harsh justice after the Miranda de Ebro pogrom only increased the King's evergrowing fame which would later dub him Pedro el Cruel.

I wholeheartedly agree with Netanyahu when he asserts that "Enrique de Trastámara was certainly the chief villain in the drama of Pedro's life," because even after he fled to France in 1355, when his first attempt at overthrowing his half-brother's rule ended in defeat, he continued his smear campaign by calling him "King of the Jews," a claim he supported by accusing Pedro of putting the kingdom's interest in Jewish hands via his appointment of Don Samuel ha-Levi as the Chief Treasurer of Castile, a position which Enrique insisted gave a Jew almost unlimited power in the land. Upon his arrival in Aragon in 1356, where he enjoyed the protection of the king, Enrique continued to repeat these invectives, which found their way into Castile, where their repetition gave them momentum, which in turn, lent them an air of truth. Simultaneously, Enrique persisted in portraying himself as the standard bearer for Christian values and interests and an opponent of the supposedly oppressive Jewish power structure (102-103). One of the main reasons for Enrique's eventual success was his manipulation of the populace's anti-Jewish feelings to his own benefit. Netanyahu notes that "Enrique was the *first*

*nobleman in Spain to use anti-Semitism as an instrument of propaganda and a means of attaining political control*. In later times other Castilian nobles would follow in his footsteps" (104).

Unfortunately for Don Samuel, it seems that he became the unwitting scapegoat in Pedro's attempts to counteract Enrique's propaganda campaign because he knew that he was in a losing battle. Under the pressure of growing financial and political difficulties, Pedro acted against his former favorite because he "no doubt felt that he must do something radical to counteract the charge that he was the 'king of the Jews,' fighting a Jewish war, and bleeding the people to attain Jewish ends." With mounting concerns for his own political solvency, Pedro began to search for a reason to dismiss Don Samuel from his position, even though he had been one of his most reliable and devoted followers. As a result, the king began to take note of the slanderous accusations made by his treasurer's rivals, Jewish tax collectors and other members of the court (Netanyahu 109). After Don Samuel's maligners began a whisper campaign regarding the sources of all of his wealth, Pedro had him arrested and accused him of embezzling from the royal coffers. Netanyahu describes Don Samuel's reaction to these accusations:

> Understandably, Don Samuel was so offended by the suspicion and, above all, by the way he was treated by Don Pedro—the king whom he had served so devotedly and unflinchingly—that he refused to answer his investigators' questions. He was transferred to Seville, where he was put to the torture, but he retained his pride—and his silence—to the end. (110)

Interestingly, Don Samuel's successor was a Christian named Martín Yáñez de Sevilla.

The importance in this whole chain-of-events lies in the duplicity of Enrique de Trastámara. Eventually he succeeded in overthrowing his half-brother, with one of his major weapons being the support he garnered from the general populace and the cities with his anti-Jewish stances. However, shortly thereafter his position completely and radically changed. Netanyahu states that:

> [B]elieving that the war was virtually over, Enrique now concentrated on building his administration, and with the shameless cynicism and cold pragmatism that typified all his actions, he now reversed his policy toward the Jews. His anti-Semitic campaign, which had helped him achieve power, was no longer of any use to him, and he saw no reason to continue it. Consequently, he now looked for able Jewish financiers who could set up for him a tax-gathering system of the kind that had served the needs of his predecessors. (114)

Although many Jews were hesitant to work for Enrique, the new King found his man in Joseph Pinchón, a Sevillian Jew who was well-known for his business acumen. Castilians' reactions varied to the abrupt change; most Jews were pleasantly surprised, but the anti-Semites were alarmed and enraged. As a result, the cities' representatives to the Cortes of Burgos of February, 1367, resolved to refresh Enrique's memory as to what his previous position had been, specifically that "all the evils, damages, deaths and banishments that took place in past times occurred because of the counsels of the Jews who were the favorites and officials of the past kings" (Netanyahu 115). Subsequently, they made a formal petition that Enrique not appoint any Jews to any positions, including as doctors, within his own administration, the Courts of the Queen or those of the Infantes. He denied their request, insisting that no such demand had ever been made to

any other Castilian king, and also reassuring them by claiming that although there were Jews in his Court, they were not among the members of his Council.[31] This response was intended to appease the cities as Enrique proceeded to fill his administration with Jews as the kings before him had done.

A more blatant example of Enrique's change of position was his response to the petitions presented in the Cortes of Toledo (Sept. 1371), in which the anti-Jewish factions claimed that all Castilian Christians were in a virtual bondage of fear of and subjection to the Jews because of the power they had been given in courts of the King and the nobles and because of their status as tax gatherers. They maintained that, because all Jews are enemies of the Faith, they were using this power to bring about the destruction of the entire kingdom.[32] What follows is a list of their requests:

> Since it has been the kings' wish that this bad company live in these kingdoms, let them agree in their mercy that they [i.e., the Jews] be marked and separated from the Christians as God has commanded and as the laws have ordered—and [namely,] that they wear signs as they do in other kingdoms, so that they might be recognized among Christians and be less inclined to cause so much evil and do so much harm as they are presently doing. Apart from this, let the kings see to it that they have no office either in their own courts or in the court of any lord . . . nor serve as farmers of royal taxes—offices by means of which they commit, through their falsehoods, many violations of rights. . . . Since they have to live as bearers of testimony to the death of our Lord Jesus Christ, let them live and work only in the offices [that suit them and] to which they have been habituated, as they live and work in other kingdoms which some of them inhabit.[33]

Enrique denied all of their demands, except that of the badges and that Jews not be allowed to have Christian names, both of which he knew were unenforceable as they had been in the past. To later requests Enrique would give in on some points, but the petitioners soon saw that they were not going to be heard. Essentially, Enrique tried to manage the anger of the cities by giving in on certain less significant issues while maintaining the pro-Jewish course of the policies of previous kings. The control of financial matters continued to belong to the Jewish administrators (Netanyahu 120).

Enrique's own political success would in the end cost the Jews greatly because of the increasing agitation of the anti-Jewish bees' nest that he had stirred. It would not be fair, however, to place the blame of the catastrophes that followed entirely at Enrique's feet. We must take into account the waves of Black Death that repeatedly struck the Peninsula, beginning in 1348, the turmoil created by the Castilian Civil War and the terrible defeat suffered by the Castilians at Aljubarrota in 1385, which ended the kingdom's efforts to annex Portugal. After the early death of Enrique de Trastámara's successor, Juan I, in 1390, the country was ripe for the outbreak against "an alien defenseless minority, with royal support," who had risen "above the masses of the majority, whose constant aversion for that minority was thereby turned into a fiery hostility" (Netanyahu 128).

Sadly enough, this hatred was nurtured by an Andalusian priest of humble birth, named Ferrán Martínez, who decided that Spain must expel all of its Jews because they were guilty of deicide. Although this practice was an actuality in many parts of Europe, such as in certain Italian and German cities and in several kingdoms such as England and France, no such expulsions had, as yet, taken place anywhere in Spain (Netanyahu 130).

Sometime around 1378, Martínez began to preach hate for Jews from the pulpit and began to use his position as diocesan judge of Seville to persecute his Jewish neighbors. Enrique's reaction was swift, strongly forbidding Martínez to continue his practices as well as instructing the Sevillian officials to protect the Jews living there from the priest and informing the Jews that they were not under Martinez's jurisdiction (Netanyahu 131-132). After both Enrique's and his successor Juan I's deaths, the crown remained in the hands of a Regency which soon became disjointed and weak. Thus, the time was propitious for Martinez and his followers to strike and on June 4, 1391, that is precisely what happened. The Sevillian *judería* was brutally attacked at dawn from all angles, and what little protection the Jews there had for themselves quickly gave way to a massive spree of violence in which thousands of men perished and just as many women and children were captured with the intention of selling them as slaves. About 20,000 Jews managed to survive the onslaught by rushing from their homes to be baptized—seeing conversion as their only means of survival. Upon returning to their houses, they found that they had been sacked and burned, leaving them with little left but their own lives. Rather conspicuously, the royal forces that had been ordered to protect the *judería* failed to do so, probably at the order of the regency's representative in Seville, Ponce de León, who, we can assume, would not want to be confronted with an angry riotous mob (Netanyahu 148-149).

The riots of Seville caused a ripple effect of violence across the Peninsula. Pedro López de Ayala in his Crónicas recounts these incidents in a chapter, in which he asserts that:

> E fue causa aquel arcediano de Écija (Martínez) deste levantamiento contra los judíos de Castilla; e perdiéronse por este levantamiento en este tiempo las aljamas de los judíos de Sevilla, e Córdoba, e Burgos, e Toledo, e Logroño e otras muchas del regno; en en Aragón, las de Barcelona e Valencia, e otras muchas; e los que escaparon quedaron muy pobres, dando muy grandes dádivas a los señores por ser guardados de tan grand tribulación. (713)

The pogromist movement devastated the Jewish population in Spain and had the effect of creating a very large group of converts to Christianity. Unfortunately, these conversions would not satisfy the boiling hatred of anti-Semites, and their persecutorial forces soon found a new target in the New Christians. In the centuries that followed this would become one of the major topics on the political and literary landscape of Spain.

Up until the second half of the fourteenth century, the Jews in Castile had fared rather well in their abilities to live prosperous lives on their own terms, following their religious customs and carrying on with their business. Beginning around 1000, Jews begin to flock to Spain in greater numbers, and as their population steadily increased, they established communities all over the Peninsula. There, they enjoyed the greatest political clout and economic prominence of any other place in Europe during the Middle Ages (Netanyahu 55). Netanyahu maintains that the fact that

> for two full centuries—from 1050 to 1252—the Jewish question was hardly discussed in the Spanish legislative assemblies (in which the cities were not represented), is in itself a clear indication that the policy toward the Jews was not, in the main, determined by religious considerations. For the Spaniards in those

> centuries were certainly no less Christian and the Jews no less Jewish than they were in later times. (91)

Obviously, the animosity that the Christians felt toward the Jews was prevalent during these centuries, for such an intense hatred could not just spring up over the period of a few years. Therefore, the fact that it would take more than 400 years for the expulsion of the Jews from the Peninsula to become a reality is a testament to the power of the nobility and the monarchy who both traditionally supported the Jewish cause. The Castilian monarchy had acted as a constant protector of the Jews living within their territories, even though it must be said that starting in 1250, there were occasions when they would withdraw their protection, albeit for strategic purposes when under pressure from the masses. However, these were generally short-lived, and the monarchy would return their support to their Jewish citizens as soon as they were in a position to do so (Netanyahu 68). After this period of relative stability, Netanyahu believes there

> came a period of great crisis and transition, which lasted four decades (1350-1390), followed by a century which began with catastrophe, continued with stabilization on a much lower level, and ended with the precipitate fall of the Expulsion (1492). Throughout this period of transition, as well as for most of the subsequent century (1390-1492), we see the kings making determined efforts to defend the Jews against a rising opposition that steadily became more intense and widespread until it assumed menacing proportions. Thus, in this period the Spanish kings pursued their distinctly pro-Jewish policy not only against world opinion—i.e., the Christian world, of which their kingdoms were part—but also against the dominant opinion of their own people. This shows that some, if not

most, of the services the Jews rendered their administrations were considered by the kings vital for their regimes and that therefore they were anxious to retain them. The kings continued to defend the Jews' traditional positions even against constantly increasing odds. (73)

It was when the nobility and the monarchy began to use the Jewish question as a political chess piece that the situation of the Jews in the Peninsula truly started to deteriorate. This did not change after the pogroms of 1391, when the large numbers of conversions transformed the focus of anti-Semitism from the Jewish question to the *converso* problem. One would think that the serious reduction of the Jewish population would satisfy the masses' hatred, which was ironically clothed in religious zeal; however, the resulting population of New Christians created yet a much larger and more complex issue—what to do about this large group of *conversos* who expected to have the same rights and privileges as their fellow Christian citizens, rights and privileges which had previously been denied to them in many cases. This question would become one of the major points of debate during the fifteenth century and would continue to be manipulated by the political players of the time whenever they felt the need for popular support.[34]

Tumultuous would probably be the best word to describe the political and social landscape of Castile in the fifteenth century. It was bookended by two administrations' struggles to consolidate monarchical power, that of Juan II and of the Catholic Monarchs. In the middle we observe the seeming incompetence of Enrique IV, whose reign was marked by betrayals and intrigues. One also notes a new figure on the scene—the *valido*—the king's favorite, Álvaro de Luna for Juan II, and Juan Pacheco for Enrique IV, both enigmatic characters who essentially masterminded and manipulated the

political scene of their respective time periods. Throughout the entire era the grandees constantly created factions and caused friction as they positioned themselves to achieve greater power and wealth. The century culminated with the events of 1492, which so many historians have monumentalized as one of the greatest years in the annals of Spain. However, if we took the moral and spiritual temperature of the populace, the "glorious" accomplishments of that year might have been overshadowed by a growing crisis as their traditional value system became functionally irrelevant. This is evident when one reads a novel like Cárcel de Amor because the reader is struck by the sense of pessimism and despair at the spiritual condition that San Pedro reveals in his characters. We shall now turn our attention to the major events of the fifteenth century and what they reveal about the condition of the society in which they took place.

After the death of Enrique III in 1410, Castile remained in the hands of a regency whose power was divided between Queen Catalina, Juan II's mother, and his uncle Ferdinand. At age 18, Alvaro de Luna, the illegitimate son of an Aragonese nobleman and a plebeian mother, entered the Court of Queen Catalina as her *doncel* and began his friendship with the young Prince. Netanyahu notes that "Alvaro fostered his friendship with the Prince to a point where the latter became addicted to his company, and within less than two years he was formally appointed as the future king's page" (Netanyahu 219). Juan became so dependent on his companion that, as José Antonio Vaca de Osma recounts it: "cuando muere la reina viuda y el rey tiene catorce años, es la única persona que Juan II quiere tener a su lado, hasta el punto de que le hace dormir a los pies de su cama, llegando su adoración a echarse a llorar si se alejaba de él" (25). The intimacy that Alvaro and Juan shared from the King's childhood is undeniable. What is most

interesting is how it manifested itself over time and what exactly must have transpired to cause Juan to turn on Alvaro in the end. Nonetheless, Alvaro's influence on the political situation of Castile during the first half of the fifteenth century is incalculable for various reasons: first, his relationship with Juan II granted him such power that his desire and the king's were practically one; second, his inclusion of the Jews and the *converso*s in the King's administration drastically changed their social position for better and for worse; and finally, his battle with Castile's grandees, in order to consolidate Juan's power, created a general enmity between the Crown and the nobles that profoundly affected the political landscape of the entire century.

In March of 1419, the Cortes met in Madrid in order to transfer power from the Regency to Juan II; however, this action did not settle the matter in the eyes of the Infantes of Aragón (Enrique and Juan), whose father Ferdinand de Antequera had co-ruled Castile for nearly a decade. Enrique, taking advantage of his brother's absence, planned a coup for July of 1420, taking the young King hostage. It was only by Alvaro's cunning that Juan II was able to escape and thus sidestep the Infante's attempts to overthrow him. By doing so, Netanyahu says that "a veritable revolution took place in his (the King's) entire condition" because:

> [h]is rebuff of Enrique's request to see him, coupled with the order he gave him (that he and his besiegers leave the place at once), signified not only his restored freedom, but also his return to a state of kingship that Castile had not known since Enrique III. A barrier was placed between the sovereign and the barons which emphasized the King's elevated status and which the magnates, especially those suspected of disloyalty, found it thenceforward often hard to pass. (234-235)

Not only was the King's power transformed by these events, but also Alvaro's new position was firmly established. This is evidenced in the Infante Juan's petition to remain at Talavera for a few days to pay reverence to his cousin and to congratulate him on his freedom. Fernán Pérez de Guzmán recounts the scene, in his Crónica del Serenísimo Príncipe Don Juan, Segundo Rey deste nombre en Castilla y en León: "Alvaro de Luna le respondió que trabajaria en ello, pero que dudaba si se podia acabar, [. . .]. Alvaro de Luna respondiese al Infante Don Juan que no le convenia por entonce procurar de quedar en la Corte, [. . .]. Y el Infante Don Juan, conoscida la voluntad de Alvaro de Luna, vido que no le cumplia mas porfiar de quedar allí, [. . .]" (398). Up until this time Alvaro had remained in the background, but now his presence was obvious in that he was the gatekeeper, so to speak, to gain access to the king. Netanyahu believes that:

> at that moment a major new factor appeared on the scene of Castile's politics: 'the will of Alvaro de Luna.' The mask had fallen from Alvaro's face and everyone could see the real man: a statesman of stature with a firm grasp on the helm of Castile's ship of state. That ship, [. . .] [which] had been floundering without a captain in a stormy sea, was navigated hereafter with great courage and astuteness by its new master, Alvaro. It took only a few weeks for his abilities to be recognized and his authority to be established throughout the country. (235)

Important in understanding the hatred that Alvaro soon engendered from all levels of Castilian society is an evaluation of his political beliefs. First and foremost, he was an advocate for a strong monarchy, one in which the king's power was supreme above all others. Although some could, and have, cynically accused him of tirelessly supporting the cause of Juan II for his own material gain, it seems that if this had been his singular

motivation, he would have taken the easier and safer route of supporting the intentions to the throne of one of the Infantes of Aragon, instead of the cause of the underdog, a weak and humiliated young king. Of course, we cannot know for sure what were the reasons for his course of action, but Netanyahu suggests that "[h]e may have been moved by his reflections on Castile's political situation; or by some mystical adoration of kingship which may sometime in his youth have been planted in his mind; or by a chivalric instinct which drove him to defend the threatened and defenseless young prince" (Netanyahu 236). Whatever his motivations, it is clear that Alvaro was dedicated to protect the rights of Juan II as king. This singlemindedness of purpose was the impetus of fierce political, and at times military, conflicts with the nobles and the cities, both of which were equally determined to defend their own interests.

Alvaro's dedication to the notion of a strong monarchy led him to take steps that fostered the resentment that would lead to his eventual downfall. On example of his willingness to make determinations that he felt were in the best interests of the monarchy, no matter how unpopular that might have been, was his decision to re-establish the Jewish presence in the administration of the royal treasury and tax gathering. He had to have known from recent history that his inclusion of Jews in the government would foster negative feelings towards both himself and the royal bureaucracy, but he judged that they were the only means to restructure the government's financial workings. The effect for the Jews of this reversal of policy was to revitalize the Jewish citizenry, a situation that persisted for the next three generations, almost until the end of the fifteenth century. Similarly, Alvaro included the *converso*s in various capacities of the royal administration, doggedly maintaining this inclusionary stance despite all the obstacles of popular opinion

and the warnings of history. This stubborn adherence to a policy that he felt would benefit the monarchy was at the same time both a decisive strength and his principal weakness (Netanyahu 236-237).

One of Alvaro's most important decisions was to create a new kind of royal bureaucracy. In the past the higher positions had primarily been filled by members of the most prominent noble families on whom the King could not depend to make decisions in his best interests, being that they all had their own welfare at stake as well. He also realized that the duality of the monarchy's administrators trickled down to even the lower levels of his government, which were largely appointed by the nobles who held the higher offices. Even these low-level officials were apt to take actions favorable to the grandees who had appointed them. One might think that Alvaro could look to members of the urban oligarchies as possible candidates to serve the King, but he feared that their ambitions made them a poor choice as well. Therefore, he set his sights on the *converso*s as the best group to run the royal machine because, similar to their Jewish ancestors, they were loyal to the King, but different, in that, as Christians, they did not, at that time, have any of the restrictions that had been placed on their kinsmen. This new group of bureaucrats soon proved themselves to be both loyal and efficient, and their lack of concern for the nobles' desires enraged the grandees, who were accustomed to receiving preferential treatment. This caused the nobility to despise Alvaro even more and also to grow bitter against the *converso*s because they perceived them as the holders of positions which they felt should naturally belong to men of high birth. This resentment caused the nobles to be hyper-critical of both Alvaro and his new administration where otherwise

one might have objectively praised their efforts to run the kingdom much more efficiently and fairly than in the past (Netanyahu 237-238).

In order to paint these men in the worst possible light, the nobles attempted to portray them as Alvaro's cronies. Naturally, at this point, Juan II still completely trusted his *valido*, so anyone who worked for Alvaro served the King's interests as well. To counteract the Monarch's confidence in Alvaro, ergo the new breed of bureaucrats, the grandees began to accuse him of plotting behind King Juan's back in order to serve his own interests. In 1440, members of some of the most important noble families, including the King's own son, Prince Enrique, sent a letter to Juan II in which they described the tyrannical government of Alvaro: "Que ya su Alteza sabia quantos males y daños, é disipaciones é trabajos se habian seguido en sus Reynos por la tiránica e dura governación del su Condestable Don Álvaro de Luna." They also pointed out to Juan II their perception that "siempre su voluntad estaba sujeta al Condestable, é que se guiaba é governaba por su consejo, así en ausencia como en presencia; lo qual claramente se mostraba porque habia desechado de su Corte á todos los Grandes de sus Reynos, e tenia consigo á los criados é familiares del Condestable" (Pérez de Guzmán 570). With these accusations the grandees wanted to create the impression that it was Alvaro, and not the King, who was really in control, and as such, the Monarch bore no responsibility for the current situation which had placed them on the outside looking in. When one reads the chronicles of the reign of Juan II, one notices the constant and ever-changing formations of one band of nobles after another. They were almost always plotting against Alvaro, unless it was to their advantage to include him in their dealings. Even the King's heir, Enrique, was a party to these intrigues, which appeared to be the result of his relationship

with Juan Pacheco. Interestingly, it was Alvaro de Luna who had chosen Pacheco to be the companion of the Prince from his childhood. As Alonso de Palencia confirms in his description of Enrique's post-wedding failure to consummate his marriage with Doña Blanca de Navarre:

> Empezaron, por ultimo, a circular atrevidos cantares y coplas de palaciegos, ridiculizando la frustrada consumación del matrimonio, y aludiendo a la mayor facilidad que D. Enrique encontraba en sus impúdicas relaciones con sus cómplices. Era el principal de ellos D. Juan Pachecho, de extremada condescendencia y que todo lo sacrificaba a la ambición de mando, aun a costa de las mayores torpezas. Sagaz, diestro y astuto, habíale escogido D. Alvaro desde niño para doncel de D. Enrique, creyendo que no se desviaría un punto de sus instrucciones; por lo cual acostumbraba elogiar su natural ingenio como ejecutor de la propia iniciativa, y se complacía en ensalzar sus cualidades y su disposición para todo género de servicios. (Palencia 10)

Alvaro's trust in Pacheco proved to be a serious miscalculation in his own judgment because the only interests that the future Marqués de Villena sought to protect were his own. These were tenuous times for Alvaro because, in order to appease the grandees, Juan II had agreed to remove Alvaro from his court for a period of time. He had just barely been allowed back at Court when his enemies, including Pacheco, were already plotting against him. Palencia recounts how Pacheco instructed the Prince to collaborate with his uncles, the former pretenders to his father's throne, in order to achieve a separation between the King and his favorite.[35] Although the grandees and the Queen had sought almost since the beginning of Juan II's reign to remove Alvaro from

the King's confidence, beginning in 1440, with the addition of the Prince, who was manipulated by Pacheco, these attempts became more concentrated as the hatred of Alvaro grew to a frenzied pitch. Palencia described the intensity of the situation:

> Trabajaba el Rey entretanto por traer de nuevo a D. Alvaro a su lado, y convencido de que jamás podría recabarlo de su mujer, de sus hermanos ni de los Grandes, apeló a la astucia; y mientras ellos por su parte y la Reina con el Príncipe intentaban sitiar al Favorito, seguros de que, hasta aniquilarle, les sería imposible conciliarse la voluntad del Rey, éste se aseguraba el apoyo de algunos de sus parciales, unánimes en posponerlo todo a la persona de D. Alvaro. La Reina, que ya había sufrido tantas desgracias, entre ellas la separación del marido, constante deseo del Privado, excitaba a su hijo D. Enrique y a sus hermanos a la ruina de aquél, por la que todos trabajaban. (Palencia 12)

Their attempts at Alvaro's ruin met with varying degrees of success in that they managed to convince the King to remove his favorite from court several times, but Juan II allowed him to return. After the sudden and suspicious death of the Queen, Alvaro arranged for Juan to marry Doña Isabel de Portugal, whom the King accepted, even though she was not his first choice. This would prove to be another fateful decision on Alvaro's part.

As stated earlier, Alvaro's employ of many *conversos* in the King's administration created resentment towards him on the part of the nobles but also the cities as well. The nobles' anger was not focused directly on the New Christians, because they did not see them, but rather Alvaro, as the root of the threats to their own power (Netanyahu 248). On the contrary, the Old Christian oligarchies in the cities felt political, economic and social animosity towards the *conversos*, who were rising in

stature in the King's administration, where the cities had constantly been denied representation, and also as the Crown's appointments in their local governments. The cities vehemently opposed New Christian dominion over them, especially, as was the case in many instances, when these appointees were not even citizens of their town. This move on Alvaro's part was yet another facet of his plan to consolidate the King's power over the realm. Repeatedly the cities brought their complaints to the King, but, knowing their limitations, they were forced to accept his promises to grant their requests, which largely went unfulfilled. The situation changed when, in 1440, the nobles decided to rebel against the King, and in order to gain urban support, they began to back up the cities' claims. In the nobles' address to the King from that year, they accuse Alvaro of trying to exert his own will over the cities, therefore subjugating their rights, through the appointment of his own men, many of whom were New Christians, to important urban positions of authority, against the wishes of the towns, so that they might act as informants for the *valido* regarding any important urban proposals or issues.[36] In this debate it is important to note the nobles' willingness to incite the populace to take action against the *converso*s to meet their political ends. Such was the situation that brought about the events in Toledo of 1449. Incensed by the usurping of their local power and by a particular tax that Alvaro demanded of them, the citizens, led by Pero Sarmiento (an Alvaro hater) and Marcos Garcia (a *converso* hater), organized a multi-faceted attack on the cities' rich New Christian upper class, that included their arrest, torture-induced confessions of collusion with Alvaro against the city's government, confiscations of their possessions and killing of their leader Juan de la Cibdad. While the original charges against the New Christians were of a political nature, the leaders soon moved to the

religious realm, accusing them of being secret Jews and creating an unofficial inquisition that tried and burned many *converso*s without consent of the Pope, the King or even the Archbishop. The King soon came to Toledo to try to gain control of the city in an attempt to reestablish order and peace. In May of 1449, Sarmiento penned a letter to Juan II in which he communicated the Toledans' demands centering around Alvaro and his official appointments. Pedro de Guzmán's Crónica relates the contents of this missive in which they requested that the Grandees, prelates and the cities' *procuradores* meet so that "las cosas se viesen por justicia é se remediasen, como cumplia á servicio de Dios é suyo, é bien de sus Reynos." Sarmiento also threatens that if the King fails to meet his demands, the cities "se juntarian . . ., é traspasarian é cedarian la justicia é jurisdicción real en el Illustrísimo Príncipe Don Enrique [. . .]" (664-665). Sarmiento's petition sounds very similar to the Grandees' many complaints to Juan II regarding Alvaro, but in an extended version of this letter, included in the Abreviación del Halconero, we find that he actually goes even further when he takes aim at the *converso*s in general, accusing them because they are "fallados ser ynfieles e herejes, e han judayzado e judayzan, e han guardado e guardan los más dellos los rritos e cerimonias de los judíos," and that also "so color e nombre de cristianos prebaricando, extroxesen las animas e cuerpos e faziendas de los cristianos viejos en la fee catolica" (Carrillo de Huete 523).

The threat contained in Sarmiento's Petition so angered Juan II that he did not even dignify it with a response. Enrique, once again on the outs with his father, was pleased to take control over Toledo, an action the Prince attempted to explain as his attempt to return the city to the King's control—an explanation the King rejected. However, when Enrique and Pacheco arrived with a large contingent of troops, Juan II

was forced to withdraw in order to avoid a clash with his son. Sarmiento must have perceived the king's retreat as a sign of victory, but the end result was that the Prince and Pacheco, not Sarmiento had gained control over Toledo (Netanyahu 323). Although the terms of Sarmiento's negotiations assured him that he would never be held accountable for the crimes he had committed against the Toledan *converso*s and that he could keep the property that he had stolen from them, he also managed to obtain definitive assurances that the New Christians he had run out of the city would not be granted permission to move back into the town or to resume their official functions and that his appointed replacements would be allowed to maintain their posts.[37]

Dissatisfied with the lack of any real power that Sarmiento and his partisans now had in Toledo, they decided to take their anti-*converso* campaign one step further, and in June of 1449 they held a town meeting attended by a cross-section of the city's populace (except for members of the high nobility). The purpose of this meeting was to draft an ordinance which would regulate the city's dealings with the *converso*s (Netanyahu 324). The law, which came to be known as the Sentencia-Estatuto: consisted of two parts (hence the name): the Judgment and the Statute. In the Judgment, the Toledans maintained that the negative qualities of the Jewish people did not change as a result of their conversions to Christianity, and thus they were still problematic as a social group. The Statute essentially stripped the *converso*s' rights to hold any public or private post, any ecclesiastical office, nor were they able to serve as witnesses in court. These limitations, according to the Statute, were intended not only for the converts currently living in the city but also for their immediate offspring and future descendants as well (Netanyahu 325). Soon after the passing of the Sentencia-Estatuto, the Prince

triumphantly entered Toledo as its new leader. The New Christians there must have been alarmed by Enrique's silence on this law which he must have thought a necessary evil in order for him to maintain control over the city. The *converso*s' fears were warranted because as Netanyahu describes the new law:

> [T]his was no longer an unruly action by antiroyal rebels who had captured a city. This was the formal policy of a city, now run primarily by a national leader. The Statute was therefore persecution institutionalized. The fact that such a law, and such a regime, could be tolerated by Prince Enrique, the heir apparent, the future king of Castile and León, seemed to spell disaster for all New Christians. Sooner or later, the example of Toledo would spread to other cities in the country, and finally embrace the whole of Castile and the rest of the peninsula. (330)

Some of the higher ranking New Christian leaders in the country appealed to the Pope, Nicholas V, whose reaction to the news of the treatment of the *converso*s in Toledo (and by this time also in Ciudad Real) was swift. He issued a Bull in September, denouncing Sarmiento's actions as being "criminal offenses, which not only work to the detriment of the faith, but also pose a danger to the state of the kingdom and bring about the destruction of its subjects."[38] Nicholas V not only declared that the perpetrators of these actions be excommunicated and also punished according to the local laws, but he also ordered all princes, dukes, etc. come to Juan II's aid to regain control of Toledo in order to restore order there and protect its citizens (Netanyahu 337). By year's end, Enrique had returned control of the city to his father, as a result of a series of negotiations between Pacheco and Alvaro. Although in the end many of the perpetrators of the crimes against the Marranos were punished with death or exile, it appears that out of the talks

with the Toledans Alvaro conceded on one major point which must have astounded the *converso*s for whom Alvaro had always been a faithful ally, and that is that he agreed to petition the Pope for a bull that would establish an inquisition in Castile. Although such a bull was indeed granted in November of 1451, it was never published—a fact which we can most likely attribute to Juan II and the high-ranking *converso*s who were close to him such as Alonso de Cartagena and Fernán Díaz de Toledo (Netanyahu 680).

These events reveal an important step in Castile's path toward the actual creation of the Inquisition. For the first time, the grumblings against the *converso*s gained the momentum of a concerted, official platform. In the case of Toledo the hatred towards them originally was based on the city's contempt of Alvaro's policy and his partisans, but soon moved into the religious realm with unfounded accusations of judaizing, claims made to foster popular hatred for convert*s*, most of whom who had been Christians for several generations already. In order to substantiate their claims against them, the rebels devised the idea that the crimes of the Jews (in their estimation) were conferred upon their offspring, both Christian and Jewish, and that all of their actions were a grand scheme to bring about the downfall of Castile with a final goal of subjugating Christians under Jewish dominion. They succeeded by transferring the hatred of the Jews of their forefathers into enmity for New Christians because now Jew equaled *converso* in the anti-Semitic dialogue that continued on, past the creation of the actual Inquisition in 1484. The Sentencia-Estatuto represented the transference of what had been a general enmity towards Jews and then *converso*s of a more popular nature into an ideology that now had gained the force of law. The essence of the Statute would come to define the

Spanish treatment and posture towards that segment of its population over the next few centuries (Netanyahu 382).

As the reign of Juan II drew to a close, one last, but very significant chapter was yet to be played out, and that was the King's ultimate betrayal of his longtime Condestable. It is difficult to read any of the chronicles of the time without gaining an understanding of the extent of the hatred that was directed toward Alvaro de Luna, and yet, if these historians (and the grandees whose attitudes they echoed) had not had their judgment clouded by the political gamesmanship of the time and their own personal interests, maybe they would have thought differently of Alvaro, seeing in him, instead of a greedy usurper of power, a servant of the King, whose every action, even in his death, was undertaken to improve Juan II's monarchical position. Ironically, it was Alvaro's chosen bride for Juan II, Isabel de Portugal, whose jealousy of the influence of her husband's favorite spurred her to persuade the King to betray his *valido*. The many accounts which narrate the events of the Maestre's execution imbued him with a considerable amount of dignity that belied their general treatment of him elsewhere. Interesting is a remark made by Alonso de Palencia regarding Juan II's conduct towards Alvaro:

> Con razón censuraron los discretos la maldad del Rey que vivió tanto tiempo miserablemente para que aquel bastardo y perverso gozase de mayor felicidad; y luego, al cabo de cerca de cuarenta años, cambiando con poca moderación de conducta, tal vez a impulsos del temor, mandó dar, tan atroz muerte al que en su vejez había elevado, a la dignidad de maestre de Santiago, sin avergonzarse tampoco de escribir a los Príncipes y Magnates de Europa, anunciándoles el caso

> y pidiendo sus enhorabuenas por haber recobrado su libertad tras larga y humillante servidumbre. (Palencia 49)

There is no doubt that Juan II's actions were motivated by fear, as Palencia suggests, because he had even warned Alvaro to leave before the time came when "aunquél lo quisiese socorrer, no podría" (Pérez de Guzmán 680).

The weakness that Juan II exuded in this situation probably would have been more apparent throughout his entire reign, if it had not been for the strength of Alvaro de Luna. Enrique IV, plagued by the same weakness as his father, was much less fortunate in his choice of *valido*, Juan Pacheco, who proved to be every ounce as crafty as Alvaro, but who did not possess the slightest sense of loyalty to his king. The chronicles recount betrayal after betrayal of Enrique IV's trust, confidence, equanimity and friendship at the hands of Pacheco who, through the generosity (and without a doubt weakness and, quite possibly, stupidity) of the Monarch became almost certainly the most powerful man in the kingdom, possessing the Mastership of the Order of Santiago, the Marquisate of Villena and countless other titles. During the reign of Enrique IV, the relationship between the King and Pacheco was extremely complicated and unstable. Many times the Monarch discovered the Marquis' blatant betrayals, but strangely, instead of punishing him, Enrique would reward him in order to lure him back to his side. One perfect example of Pacheco's perfidy can be seen in his collusion with Louis XI, King of France, regarding the offer that the people of Catalonia had extended to Enrique IV to become his subjects. Pacheco, among others, strongly cautioned the King to desist from accepting this role. When Enrique learned that Pacheco had received a reward from Louis, he realized that he had been betrayed. In these situations, Pacheco would typically stay

away from the Royal Court for a time, begin to make alliances with other Castilian nobles to plot against Enrique, and then would play both sides of the political crisis du jour, so that he could come out on top in the end. The chronicler, Diego Enríquez del Castillo, describes Pacheco as "el gran revolvedor del reino, pues jugaba siempre a doble juego, quedándose con los de ganar" (182).

Enrique's rather conciliatory reaction to Pacheco's and others' betrayals of his trust is difficult to judge insofar as how it reflects upon his character. Was he merely weak or did he, in fact, believe in a policy of forgiveness? The answer, in my estimation, is that it could be a little of both. Enrique discussed his view of the proper attitude of a king towards rebellious subjects in his coronation address:

> It sometimes happens that great power moves rulers to do evil rather than good, and that absolute authority induces great princes to employ fury more than gracious kindness. It is therefore necessary that those who have reached such heights, if they wish to follow the true pattern of nobility, and be considered true nobles, be clothed in clemency and girded with pity. For the power and command of the royal person, the ruling and governing of the virtuous King, are placed in him only to make him magnanimous, gracious and benign, forgetful of the injuries he had suffered and grantor of rewards for his services.[39]

Perhaps it was these views which caused him always to prefer to negotiate as opposed to just imposing his own will through the use of force. He was particularly adverse to the idea of subjecting the kingdom to the horrors of a civil war as a means to resolve matters that boiled down to power struggles among the grandees and himself. True to the words of his coronation address, Enrique demonstrated extreme levels of clemency towards

even the most blatant traitors, many times appealing to their avarice in order to gain their support. We may judge this tendency as being a weakness, but we must also consider that he sincerely believed that these tactics were more favorable than the alternatives. Towards the end of his reign, however, his extreme clemency, especially toward Pacheco, began to exasperate the few nobles who had actually remained loyal to him over the years (Netanyahu 719). While it is quite possible that the beautiful sentiments expressed by Enrique at his coronation explain his seeming unwillingness to punish Pacheco and his partisans, it is also a fact that his attitude only exacerbated the turmoil of his reign. Fernando del Pulgar in his Claros varones de Castilla echoes this idea in his description of the Monarch: "Era ombre piadoso y no tenía ánimo de fazer mal, ni ver padescer a ninguno, y tan humano era que con dificultad mandava executar la justicia criminal. Y en la execución de la cevil y en las otras cosas necesarias a la governación de sus reinos algunas vezes era negligente" (83).

Enrique's philosophy of kingship must have developed sometime after he actually became King because, as the Prince, he demonstrated no hesitation in instigating acts of violence as well as brutally punishing those he considered to be traitors (Netanyahu 722). One possible explanation for this change in attitude could be that sometime during or immediately after the events in Toledo he attempted, with varying degrees of success, to extricate himself from the personal influence of Pacheco. Whatever his reasons, both in Enrique's words and in his actions, one does note a fairly consistent pattern of behavior. The majority of chroniclers contemporary to Enrique and also many modern historians paint a picture of Enrique as a disastrous ruler. The King's fatal error was his belief that

his views on kingship could actually work in the real world. Netanyahu calls this "Enrique's insurmountable difficulty, as well as his fatal mistake," and he continues:

> *He thought that he could act like a Christian king in a Machiavellian society*—that is, a society governed by principles diametrically opposed to his. Against the ideas of force, treachery, cruelty, cunning, vengeance, intimidation and death, which were believed to be the most effective means to achieve political ends, he pitted his own Christian ideas as measures of practical policy. Hence his love of peace, his forgiveness, his compassion, his clemency, his charity, his humanity and humility [. . .]. Hence also his tragic fate and, politically, his failure. (723)

This whole concept of Christian king versus Machiavellian prince will be an important contrast to keep in mind in our discussion of the political message of Cárcel.

If Enrique truly was this shining example of a Christian king, that is certainly not how he has been remembered. Quite to the contrary, upon reading virtually every contemporary account of his life, the descriptions focus on his lack of morality, his reputed impotence, his lack of justice--just about every negative attribute that one could imagine is attributed to him. It is worthy of note that for the first ten years of Enrique's reign, he enjoyed a period of relative popularity and peace, even having been asked to accept the Catalonians as vassals. However, his fortunes suffered a drastic shift when the Castilian nobles began in earnest to plot behind his back.[40] One of their principal strategies was to begin a smear campaign that was meant to undermine Enrique's popular support and embarrass him personally. It has been said that "apart from Pedro I, no Castilian king was so defamed" (Netanyahu 718). These efforts appear to have been

extremely successful because it is these characterizations, whose degree of authenticity we will never know, that have come to define Enrique.

The criticisms of Enrique range in severity and topic, therefore, I will provide a few of them below. Alonso de Palencia places in doubt the King's Christian convictions at the same time that he charges Enrique with the moral corruption of the entire kingdom when he writes:

> Entre los Grandes que con el Rey quedaron en Baena, vivía en continuo contacto con los ancianos una escogida juventud que, oyendo sus murmuraciones, solían reunirse para tratar secretamente de algunos asuntos. Distinguíase entre todos, D. Pedro de Velasco, primogénito del conde de Haro, por la viva indignación con que frecuentemente recordaba que por multitud de razones no debía tolerarse la pública ignominia, sino poner pronto dique al torrente de los crímenes y extirpar el gérmen de la ruina universal que a toda prisa se venía encima, si con energía no se obraba: que aún la contemporización con la maldad sería de fatales consecuencias, pues no eran de tal naturaleza las nefandas iniquidades de D. Enrique que debiesen o pudiesen disimularse o sufrirse por cierto tiempo: que había presumido combatir bajo el mando de aquel monstruo a una raza que, al menos, no permite que redunde en propia vergüenza la incuria de sus reyes, y esforzándose neciamente por alcanzar gloria contra ella, favoreciendo crímenes, cualquiera de los cuales bastaba para pervertir las costumbre de los naturales, la libertad, las leyes, la religión y las instituciones. Ni podía él comprender, añadía, qué especie de locura impulsaba a todos ensalzar tan entusiasta y unánimemente y a prestar humilde acatamiento a un hombre encenagado desde su más tierna niñez

> en vicios infames, y que con sin igual audacia se había atrevido, no sólo a relajar y destruir la disciplina y el orden militar, recomendadas por los antiguos, sino que hasta en el vestir y en el andar, en la comida y en la manera de recostarse para comer, y en otros secretos y muy torpes excesos, había preferido las costumbres todas de los moros a las de la religión cristiana, de la que no se descubría en él el menor vestigio, pero sí, en cambio, todo linaje de torpezas en contra del honor, para mengua de la religión, vituperio de su nombre, oprobio de los vasallos y corrupción de la humanidad entera: que considerasen por tanto atentamente, según la necesidad exigía y en semejantes peligros imperiosamente reclamaba, con qué diligente celo estaban obligados a acudir al remedio aquéllos que deseasen emular la antigua nobleza de sus antepasados. (73-74)

Palencia continued his negative characterization of Enrique as unjust and cruel in his description of the Monarch's visit to Seville in 1464. According to the account, not only did the King ignore the grand festivities that the citizens of the city had prepared in his honor, an act which Palencia judged to be deserving of "universal reprobación," but he also returned the kindness of their hospitality towards his entourage with severe ingratitude. It happened that among his courtiers were two Moors, named Mofarrax and Reduan Venegas, who were staying as guests in the home of Diego Sánchez de Orihuela. Mofarrax quickly fell in love with the daughter of his host, and although she had offered him no sign of having reciprocal feelings, he kidnapped her while her parents were away. Upon their discovery of their daughter's misfortune, they frantically appeared before Enrique in the hopes that he would right the wrong committed against them, but instead, he responded calling them "necios y locos por dejar tan mal guardada y sola en la casa a

la muchacha, dando así ocasión a aquel capricho." When they continued to protest vociferously, he ordered the executioner to beat them publicly because they refused to be silent. In horror at the Monarch's response, one of the nobles in his company, the Count of Benavente, Don Gonzalo de Guzmán sarcastically chastised the king, telling him he should have the towncrier spread the news through all Seville of the Moors' crime and the subsequent punishment of their innocent victims. Of course, this insinuation only embarrassed Enrique, but it did succeed in him allowing the insulted parents to leave without being beaten. Palencia ends this tale by informing the reader that Mofarrax went completely unpunished for his crime; in fact, he took the young Christian girl to Granada, where she remained as one of his concubines (76-77).

Palencia's disdain for Enrique is patently clear in his portrayal of the events in Sevilla, but he does not stand alone in painting such a picture of the King. In Diego de Valera's account of Enrique's reign, Memorial de diversas hazañas, his animosity towards the ruler exudes from the pages of the chronicle. In this particular example, the criticism is directed at unmerited favor that Enrique extends to men of low character:

> Y a Gómez de Cáceres dió el maestrazgo de Alcántara, que días avía que era baco por muerte del maestre don Gutierre de Sotomayor, las rentas del qual el rey avía lleuado fasta entonçes, por bula apostólica. De la prouisión de los quales no poco fueron maravillados todos los que lo vieron, porque no parecía preceder merecimientos, ni linaje, ni virtudes tan señaladas de aquellas que dinos los fiziese de conseguir tan altas dinidades, acostumbradas de dar a personas notables y de grandes merecimientos." (49)

Valera likewise notes in the following situation Enrique's propensity to fail to show proper respect toward a grandee of great repute, and to exacerbate the slight by honoring someone that at least Valera deemed to be unworthy:

> Y como la nueva de la muerte de Garcilaso al rey llegase, no con triste coraçon dixo: --Vamos a ver la fuerça que tiene la ponzoña. Y así fué sin turbación alguna a ver al desdichado cauallero, que con la yerba hazía grandes rabias. Y muerto, los parientes suyos se llegaron al rey y le suplicaron que oviese memoria de quantos seruiçios aquel noble cauallero le avía fecho, y cómo era muerto en su seruicio, y le plugiese fazer merced a vn fijo suyo, moço, de la encomienda de Montizón, que era suya, y le diese el hábito militar de la Orden de Santiago. Esta suplicación hazían al rey su tio el conde de Paredes y muchos de los caualleros que cerca del rey estauan. El rey respondió floxamente, ni denegando ni otorgando la suplicación; y en el mesmo día, por virtud del poder que tenía de administrador de la Orden de Santiago, proueyó de la dicha encomienda a vn hermano de Miguel Lucas. De lo qual todos los grandes fueron muy mal contentos; y vista la ingratitud del rey, dende adelante siempre lo desamaron. (Memorial 50-51)

The significance of these quotes lies in their demonstration of the wide range of criticisms directed toward Enrique. As Valera also reports, in 1457 the Grandees met to write a petition in which they asked Enrique to change his ways:

> suplicándole con gran reuerencia quisiese enmendar su vida y castigar las cosas mal fechas y fazer guerra de los enemigos de la fe, como cathólico rey, y no en la forma que hasta allí la avía fecho, la qual suplicación por el rey vista, no con

propósito de enmendar cosa alguna, más con pertinación y desolución más y más cada día los daños se acrecentaban." (Memorial 60-61)

They blamed Enrique for the current state of Castile, which Valera reports is only going "de mal en peor." Their letter, in which they targeted Enrique's character, demanded that he:

> [E]n casa mandase guardar toda honestidad, y fuera de ella toda ygualdad y justicia, y ternía yntegridad en el regimiento y gran prudencia en fazer diferencia entre las personas, y en el castigo de los malos toda seueridad, y en honrrar y mirar por los grandes, dando a cada vno según mereciese, y cerca de sí tuviese hombres notables, ancianos prudentes, de quien rescibiese consejos, y [. . .] apartase de sí los moros que en su compañía traya, [. . .] y en el dar de las dignidades quisiese acatar la calidad de las personas, [. . .]y las querellas de los qurellantes quisiese oyr beninamente, y a los ynjuriados proveyese con justicia, no dando lugar que los dañadores quedasen sin pena y los dañados recibiesen ynjurias, como muchas veces hasta aquí ha acaecido.(Memorial 61-62)

These requests strike at the King's character in that they insinuate that he is unjust, is lacking in his judgment of the men with whom he surrounds himself and those whom he rewards, and he is immoral. It is true that some believe that all of this was part of a smear campaign against the Monarch, but at some point, after reading chronicle after chronicle with the same types of claims, one has to begin to believe that there is some merit to their claims. Either they were overwhelmingly successful in their attempts to slander him, or they were telling the truth.

Enrique's enemies started an entire civil war with the subject of their most slanderous attack—that being, his supposed impotence. Although the rumors actually started shortly after his first marriage, when practically every account of the wedding festivities maintains that Doña Blanca remained "tal como nació," the whole affair escalated after the birth of Princess Juana, Enrique's daughter from his second marriage. A whisper campaign soon emerged, which placed in doubt her legitimacy. As Valera maintains, the Grandees "como fuesen ciertos aquella no ser fija del rey," because they were convinced of "la ympotencia del rey e de la duda de la reyna," were hesitant to recognize her as princess, so much so that some of them had to be bribed into compliance (Memorial 69). The nobles used the apparent lack of moral fiber of Queen Juana as a basis for their claims that the child was the product of an affair between her and one of the King's favorites, Beltrán de la Cueva. He was an easy target for them because he was much hated for his quick rise in status in Enrique's court. Some even accused Enrique of giving his wife to don Beltrán willingly. These attacks were very successful and were commonly accepted as being true, thus bringing about the creation of her nickname, Juana la Beltraneja.

Effectively, the charges of Juana's illegitimacy placed into serious doubt her rights as heir to the throne. Therefore, in the nobles' view, in the absence of a legitimate offspring from Enrique, the next in line would be his half-brother, Alfonso. As the grandees, led by Pacheco, became increasingly disgruntled, the idea of removing Enrique from the throne in favor of Alfonso gained momentum and culminated in the events of June of 1465. The "*farsa de Avila*," as this episode came to be known, which was to be

the nobles' ultimate betrayal of Enrique, simulated his dethroning. Valera relates this event with some interesting details:

> E finalmente, ansí por consejo de los grandes que allí estaban como de algunos famosos letrados, fué determinado que al rey don Enrique fuese tirada la corona del reyno. Para lo qual en vn llano questá çerca del muro de la cibdad de Avila, se fizo vn grande cadahalso, abierto, como de todas partes los que allí eran por ver este acto podiesen ver todo el aparato acostunbrado de se poner a los reyes, y en la silla vna estatua, a la forma del rey don Enrique, con corona en la cabeça e çetro real en la mano. Y en su presençia se leyeron muchas querellas que antel fueron dadas, de muy grandes eçesos, crímenes e delitos antel muchas vezes presentadas, sin las querellas aver avido cumplimiento de justiçia. E allí se leyeron todos los agravois por él fechos en el reyno, e las causas de su depusición, e la estrema necesidad en que todo el reyno estava para fazer la dicha depusición, aunque con gran pesar e mucho contra su voluntad. Las quales cosas ansí leydas, el arzobispo de Toledo, don Alonso Carillo, subió en el cadahalso, y quitóle la corona de la cabeça, como primado de Castilla; y el marqués de Villena, don Juan Pacheco, le quitó el çetro real de la mano, aviéndole fecho marqués de Villena, que su padre Diego Téllez no tenía más de a Belmonte, en la Mancha de Aragón; y el conde de Plazencia, don Alvaro de Estuñiga, le quitó el espada, como justiçia mayor de Castilla; y el maestre de Alcántara, don Gómez de Solís, al qual el rey fizo maestre de vn escudero hijodalgo, natural de Cáçeres, y el conde de Benavente, don Rodrigo Pimentael, y el conde de Paredes, don Rodrigo

> Manrrique, le quitaron todos los otros ornamentos reales, y con los piés le derribaron del cadahalso en tierra, y dixeron: --A tierra, puto.
>
> Y a todo esto gimian y lloraban la gente que lo veyan. E luego yncontinente el príncipe don Alonso subió en el mismo lugar, donde por todos los grandes que ende estavan le fué besada la mano por rey y señor natural destos reynos; y luego sonaron las trompetas, y se fizo muy grande alegría. Lo qual acaeció jueves, a çinco dias del mes de julio del año de Nuestro Redentor de mill y quatroçientos y sesenta y çinco años, seyendo el príncipe don Alonso de edad de onze años y çinco meses e çinco dias. (Memorial 98-99)

The conflict between Enrique and Alfonso fomented lawlessness and completely undermined Enrique's ability to rule effectively. Many of the towns, including Toledo, Seville, Burgos and Valladolid, pledged allegiance to Alfonso and ran Enrique's officials out of town. In this environment the anti-*converso* elements were emboldened and in Toledo once again an outbreak of violence against the New Christians took place in 1467. What actually began as a very specific conflict turned into the slaying of about 150 *converso*s, the execution of several of their most important leaders along with the burning and sacking of many of their neighborhoods. It seems that the damage could have been much worse, but many *converso*s found refuge from some Old Christian families as well as many nobles. Shortly after these events, the Sentencia-Estatuto was restored.[41]

Almost simultaneously the second battle of Olmedo was taking place, this time between Enrique's and Alfonso's factions; however, there was no clear outcome. The Toledans, led by Fernán Pérez de Ayala, wrote to Alfonso to congratulate him on his supposed victory and at the same time to gain approval for their actions, asking him to

allow them to maintain possession of the offices and property that they had taken from the *converso*s as well as pardon them for any offenses that they may have committed during the riots. When the Toledan delegation sensed Alfonso's disapproval, they intimated that the city would withdraw its support from his cause if he did not consent. Alfonso's answer was very clear: "Let them do what they want. It is enough that matters are in such bad shape that they can pass evil acts under dissimulation, but it would be dishonorable and shameful for me to confirm abominable and abhorred deeds."[42]

Quite to the contrary, Enrique was willing to pardon the Toledans for their crimes in exchange for their returned allegiance to him, and he even went so far as to forbid any New Christian from holding office there. Admittedly, many such promises in practice were not upheld or enforced, but still, Enrique was obviously desperate enough to agree to these terms with the Toledans on June 16, 1468. Because of Alfonso's refusal to go along with Pacheco's schemes, exemplified in his reaction to the Toledans' request, Pacheco realized that he would not be able to manipulate the young king, and then, quite suddenly, Alfonso mysteriously died on July 5, 1468, just a few weeks after the Enrique-Toledo pact, seemingly having been poisoned. Palencia, who was no great fan of Pacheco, clearly pointed the finger of guilt at Pacheco as the murderer when he describes his actions surrounding the time of Alfonso's death:

> Cuando al cabo convino marchar a tierra de Toledo y vio que toda la corrupción del aire era impotente para dañar a D. Alfonso, recurrió a la acción más eficaz del veneno, porque ya, según luego se conoció, trabajaba por la causa de D. Enrique. Juzgo yo autor de este crimen al citado Maestre, así por los indicios de su vida anterior, como principalmente por lo que voy a referir. Salió de Arévalo el rey D.

> Alfonso con su hermana D.ª Isabel el 30 de junio, y llegó antes de anochecer a la aldea de Cardeñosa, a dos leguas de Avila. Entre los demás platos presentárosle una trucha empanada, manjar a que era muy aficionado. Comió el desgraciado joven gran parte, y al punto se sintió acometido de sueño pesado y se fue a acostar sin hablar palabra. A medio día del siguiente aun no se había levantado, contra su costumbre, y entonces los de su cámara se acercaron al lecho, le llamaron, tocaron su cuerpo y, viendo que no respondía, prorrumpieron en grandes clamores. [. . .] La tristeza que se apoderó de todos los espíritus dominó a los demás dolores; solo el Maestre no pudo disimular bastante la participación que en el envenenamiento se le atribuía, y aquella misma noche cenó opíparamente con gran apetito. (250)

After Pacheco had rid himself of one king whom he could not manipulate at his whim as he had done to Enrique, he turned his attention toward Alfonso's sister Isabel and made every attempt to have her placed under his control. Pacheco, in his typical fashion, offered himself as the arbitrator between the King and the rebels of the Alfonsine party, which was now split between those who wished to return to obedience to Enrique and those who desired to continue on against him, thus supporting Isabel's cause. The rebels' principal goal was to see that the Infanta Juana would not succeed to the throne, and the parties finally reached an agreement when Enrique acquiesced on that point. A meeting took place between Enrique and his half-sister, Isabel, in September of 1468, at which time they finalized what came to be known as the Pact of Toros de Guisando. Palencia describes the details of their agreement:

> Inmediatamente D. Enrique, en presencia de todos los magnates susodichos, juró en manos del Legado que la legítima sucesión al trono pertenecía a su hermana

> D.ª Isabel, Princesa y verdadera heredera de los reinos de León y Castilla y de todos los demás Estados que como correspondientes a la corona se enumeran, no obstante lo anteriormente acordado a favor de D.ª Juana, hija de la Reina, con solemne juramento, prestado por los Grandes y por el pueblo, según costumbre de España; lo cual todo tenía por vano y de ningún valor, por cuanto amigo ya de la verdad y enemigo de la perfidia, afirmaba con la autoridad de libre y espontáneo juramento, ante Dios y los hombres, que aquella doncella no era hija suya, sino fruto de ilícitas relaciones de su adúltera esposa; y por tanto, no queriendo defraudar la legítima sucesión de estos reinos, y preciando más la pureza de las intenciones que la inícua y violenta seducción y el perjudicial engaño, declaraba públicamente todas aquellas cosas en confirmación del derecho hereditario de su hermana D.ª Isabel, actual princesa de los reinos de Castilla y de León.(263)

The most notable part of the agreement lies in Enrique's declaration of Juana's illegitimacy, which he had not previously admitted. It seems strange that Enrique would now deny his daughter's legitimacy when previously he had taken great care to preserve her rights to the throne, even going to the extreme of making the Alfonsine rebels promise that Alfonso would marry her (his own niece) so that she would be queen. It appears that starting in 1467, the present Queen had lived in Alahejos under the care of the Fonseca family. When the King sent for his wife, she refused to return to Court, and the King's messengers brought him the sad news that the Queen was expecting a child, the fruit of her affair with Fonseca's nephew (Netanyahu 795-796). Enrique was finally forced to confront the truth of his wife's infidelity and the real possibility that Juana was

not in fact his daughter. This realization is one possible explanation for Enrique's change-of-heart.

The only concession that Isabel had to make in the agreement concerned her future husband—she could not marry without consent of the king and the grandees, and, likewise, they could not force her to marry anyone against her will. The question of Isabel's husband inevitably led to a dissolution of this pact. Pacheco, again coming to the conclusion that Isabel would not be easily manipulated, began to scheme against her. Now that he was once again in a position of authority, he quickly returned to his old ways, always weaving webs of intrigue with the desire to increase his own power. One way he accomplished this was by rewarding his friends, always leaving those who had faithfully served Enrique disappointed. Yet, there was one matter about which Pacheco and the King fully agreed—that Isabella should not wed Ferdinand. On this matter, Pacheco and the Archbishop of Toledo, Alfonso Carrillo, disagreed, as the latter continued to serve as Juan II of Aragon's agent for furthering his son's hopes to marry Isabella, a desire which she shared wholeheartedly. Her unwillingness to be manipulated by Pacheco only encouraged his will to impede her path to the throne. To that end, he devised a scheme in which she would be offered as the wife of Alfonso V of Portugal, a match he knew she would refuse. At that time, he would substitute Juana as the choice of bride for the Portuguese monarch, simultaneously legitimizing her as Enrique's heiress. We can only imagine Enrique's reaction upon being presented the idea by Pacheco. He must have been completely dumbfounded that the Maestre would even consider placing the illegitimate offspring of a woman whose reputation he had destroyed on the throne of Castile. He certainly could not believe that he would do so, which gave him hope that the

entire story of her being Beltran's daughter was a lie perpetuated to destroy him from the beginning. Enrique clung to the glimmer of promise this plan provided and agreed to go along with Pacheco's idea (Netanyahu 797). In essence both sides reneged on the agreement in that Pacheco and Enrique refused to allow Isabel to marry anyone but Alfonso V of Portugal, and she had made her choice in Ferdinand, whom she married on October 18, 1469. Enrique refused all of Isabel's requests to negotiate and named Juana as his sole heiress on October 26th. Pacheco and Enrique's next task would be to find Juana a suitable mate, one who would improve her position as heir and who had the means to help her fight for the throne.

In the next few years before the question of Castilian succession would eventually be settled, the temperature of anti-*converso* ire rose many times, boiling over on several occasions into outbreaks of violence. Often these incidents were caused by the most outrageous claims of judaizing behavior on the part of the New Christians. One such example occurred in Cordova in the spring of 1473, when a young *converso* girl was accused of pouring urine out of her window onto a statue of the Virgin Mary that was passing through the street in a procession. A group of Old Christians gathered and determined that they had to avenge the disrespect shown to the Virgin and, as a result, set fire to a group of *converso* homes. The fight, which was to last two days, escalated, and as Palencia reports, many women were raped and/or murdered, many old men were killed, and homes were sacked (108). Soon similar attacks took place all across Andalusia, including the towns of Montoro, Adamuz, Bujalance, La Rambla and Santaella. Palencia suggests that Pacheco was responsible for masterminding these outbreaks, but there is no real evidence of this.

When Enrique died on December 11, 1474, his sometime advisor, sometime nemesis, Pacheco had only been dead for one month; however, the polemic over the successor to the throne had still not been settled definitively. Netanyahu believes that

> [f]ew kings came to power in a country more disorganized, more torn by dissension and more aching for good government than did the young Princes Isabella and Ferdinand when they ascended the throne of Castile. More than half a century of feverish unrest, of wars, rebellions, conspiracies and coups d'état, had left a residue of intrigue and turmoil so deeply ingrained in the life of the nation that Castile seemed always to have been on the eve of some social or political explosion. Such an explosion occurred a short time after the opening of the new reign. (915)

All things considered, it is rather remarkable that Isabel's initial succession to the throne took place in Segovia without much disagreement. Most of the cities, as well as the grandees, swore allegiance to her and Ferdinand, who, as her husband, was granted the title of "King," and at first blush, it seemed that the whole country would stand united behind the new monarchs. Following their own typical *modus operandi*, the nobles, dissatisfied with the titles and estates that had been granted to them by the new sovereigns, began to plot against them almost immediately in favor of Juana la Beltraneja. Her husband, Alfonso V of Portugal, who fully intended to stake his claim to the Castilian throne, found allies in these nobles and invaded Castile in May of 1475. These matters regarding the Catholic Kings' political survival took center-stage at the outset of their reign, but in March of 1476, after effectively crushing the Portuguese forces, which at the very least reduced the imminent threat posed by the opposition, they

were able to turn their attention to other urgent business, chiefly the establishment of law and order. Netanyahu lists their primary goals as "to gain full control of the national police forces (the *hermandades*); to suppress some of the great nobles and cities whose loyalty had not yet been secured; and to reduce the remaining nuclei of rebellion still flickering or smoldering in the northwest" (916).

By this time, Diego de San Pedro was already in the employ of the Girón family, specifically that of Don Juan Téllez-Girón, so it is relevant to our purposes to reiterate where he and his twin brother Rodrigo stood on the issue of Ferdinand and Isabel versus la Beltraneja. As I stated in the introduction, Don Juan was the nephew of Juan Pacheco and the son of Pedro Girón, himself a Master of Calatrava and a constant support to Pacheco in his wide array of dealings. In quite a comical episode, Diego de Valera in his Memorial de diversas hazañas, recounts that Don Pedro had manipulated Enrique into giving Isabel to him in marriage. The chronicler describes how Don Pedro set out for Ocaña with the intention of bending Isabel's will to his own, and in the event that she remained unconvinced, he was prepared to take her by force. Isabel's demonstrated a complete disdain for the arrangement, which Valera reports, saying that "la señora Infanta [. . .] estuvo un día y una noche las rodillas por el suelo, muy devotamente rogando á nuestro Señor que pluguiese matar á él ó á ella, porqueste casamiento no oviese efecto" (39). Her prayers were apparently answered because Don Pedro died of a sudden illness on the way to the nuptials. Valera adds that this should be a lesson to those who seek to reach high positions because of their own vanity. After their father's death, the twins' affairs were managed by Enrique de Figueredo and Juan Pacheco until they reached majority in 1472 (Whinnom, San Pedro 24).

When the nobles began to split up into factions over the question of the rights of succession of Isabel or Juana, the twins supported the Beltraneja cause, most likely due to their close family ties with their cousin Don Diego López Pacheco, Marquis of Villena and son of Juan Pacheco, and with their uncle Alfonso Carrillo, Archbishop of Toledo, who by this time had severed his formerly close relationship with Isabel. However, they also had family connections in the Isabeline party, which facilitated their return to her allegiance in May of 1476. Even after abandoning the Beltraneja party, they did not actually assist Isabel in her fight for her own succession right; they merely withdrew from the fight. However, they were both heavily involved in the subsequent campaign against Granada, which began in 1482. It is during this time that Don Juan's twin brother Rodrigo, well-known for his courage, died in a battle at Loja in that same year. After losing his brother, Don Juan invested even more of his effort and money into the cause of the Reconquest and, as a result, accompanied Ferdinand and Isabel in their triumphant entry into Granada in January of 1492. Serving in the capacity of *Notario Mayor*, it was Don Juan who was responsible for the capitulatory documents (Whinnom, San Pedro 24-25). There is also a great possibility that Diego de San Pedro accompanied Don Juan during the final phases of the war against Granada. There is some documentary evidence that relates a citizen of Peñafiel mentioning a Diego de San Pedro as a participant in the Granada campaign; San Pedro himself begins Cárcel de Amor by stating that the adventure begins "[d]espués de hecha la Guerra del año pasado, viniendo a tener el invierno a mi pobre reposo, pasando una mañana, cuando ya el sol quería esclarecer la tierra, por unos valles hondos y escuros que se hazen en la Sierra Morena, [. . .]" (81). Whinnom maintains that this clearly refers to the war against Granada as San Pedro

specifically mentions traveling through the Sierra Morena on his journey to Peñafiel for the winter (San Pedro 25).

After the completion of the Granada campaign, Don Juan Téllez-Girón returned to his estates in Andalusia. He had lost many men and invested a significant amount of his own fortune in the Reconquest; therefore he needed to put his affairs in some kind of order. The influence of his wife renowned devoutness soon began to be evident in Don Juan's own character, especially in his largesse in helping to improve the conditions of the poor. This change in Don Juan's interests affected San Pedro in that in the prologue to his Contempt of Fortune he repents of his previous frivolous writings and prefers now to write about the meaning of life (Whinnom, San Pedro 27).

We will discuss the importance of San Pedro's connections to the Téllez-Girón family in a later chapter, but now let us return to Ferdinand and Isabel's establishment of their own government. What particular qualities did the Catholic Monarchs possess that enabled them to succeed in establishing justice and in quelling the constant back-biting, self-seeking partisanship of the grandees? Was it the specific set of circumstances that they inherited or their own abilities that brought about such a drastic change in the status of the monarchy which had suffered significantly during the reign of Enrique IV? I believe that their success lies in their ability to draw support from all strata of society through a series of strategic *maneuvers*. As many fifteenth century chroniclers attest, Castile had deteriorated into a state of chaos during the reign of Enrique IV. Valera describes the direness of the situation:

> Las cosas ya dichas así passadas, estos reynos quedaron en tan corrutas e aborrecibles costumbres que cada uno usava de su libre voluntad e querer, sin

> aver quien castigar ni reprehenderlo quisiese. Las quales, tan luengamente tenidas, ya eran convertidas poco menos en naturaleza; de tal manera que en los ojos de los prudentes e sabios paresçe ser difiçile, o poco menos imposible, poderse dar orden en tanta desorden ni regla sabida en tan grand confusión. Donde ninguna justiçia se guardava, los pueblos eran destruidos, los bienes de la corona enajenados, las rentas reales reduzidas en tan poco valor que verguença me haze dezirlo. Donde no solamente en los canpos eran los hombres robados, mas en las çibdades e villas no podían seguros bivir: los religiosos y clérigos sin ningund acatamiento tractados. Eran violadas las iglesias, las mugeres forçadas, e a todos se dava suelta liçencia de pecar. (Crónica 5)

Valera saw Ferdinand and Isabel as the saviors of the kingdom in that they possessed "tanta ynclinación a justicia, tanta vigilança e soliçitud en el bien común" (6). And, he was not the only one to see in the Catholic Monarchs this picture of justice. Any student of Golden Age literature would remember Lope de Vega's representation of them, at the end of Fuenteovejuna, when Ferdinand and Isabel give audience to the villagers and find them not guilty of the crimes they are accused of, due to insufficient evidence against them. These types of audiences were apparently quite common in that the Catholic Kings reserved every Friday to preside over just such cases. This personal touch was very effective because it put a face on the judicial process, lending it legitimacy but also strengthening the monarchy's appeal with their subjects, many of whom who were weary of years of anarchy. However, this was just one aspect of their efforts to bring peace and order to their reigns. In all actuality the most important measure taken by the monarchs was their reorganization of the *Hermandades*, a medieval institution that was originally

created by the local municipalities to help preserve order. However, at the Cortes of Madrigal in 1476, these groups, which were still essentially local entities, came under the control of the Crown. J.H. Elliot describes them as "specifically municipal institutions placed at the disposal of the Crown, and magnates were carefully excluded from all judicial posts" (86-87). According to Elliot the exclusion of the magnates was aimed at keeping the *Hermandades* from becoming their own personal forces, which in the past had tended to add "to the very disorders that they were supposed to hold in check" (100).

The function of the *Hermandad* was a melding of police force with a local judiciary. Elliot outlines the specifics of its organization:

> As a police force, its task was to suppress brigandage and to patrol the roads and countryside. Every town and village was expected to provide its quota of troops, at the rate of one horseman to every hundred householders. There was a standing body of two thousand soldiers under the command of Ferdinand's brother, Alonso de Aragón, and each town had its company of archers who would turn out as soon as the hue and cry was raised, and pursue the malefactors to the limits of the town's jurisdiction, where the pursuit was taken up by a fresh company from the next town or village. [. . .]
>
> If the malefactor was caught by the *Hermandad*, he was also likely to be tried by it, for the tribunals of the *Hermandad* enjoyed complete jurisdiction over certain carefully specified classes of crimes—robbery, murder and arson committed in the open countryside, or in towns and villages when the criminal took to the country; together with rape, housebreaking, and acts of rebellion against the central government. [. . .] Either acting alone, or assisted by the

*alcaldes* from the principal judicial seat in the district, the *alcaldes* reviewed the case, pronounced judgment, and meted out the most savage penalties, which generally consisted of mutilation or a most barbarous death.

The savage punishments had the desired effect. By degrees, order was restored throughout Castile, and the country was cleared of bandits. (100-101)

At the same time that Ferdinand and Isabel were facing the difficult task of creating an established judicial system in Castile, they also had to confront the long-standing problem of the power that the grandees wielded with the utmost duplicity and self-interest, as I have shown. Apparently, the Castilian nobles were infamous for their traitorous ways as is evidenced in a Portuguese nobleman's attempts to dissuade Alfonso V from marrying Juana la Beltraneja in order to avoid all dealings with such a disloyal lot:

> Entre los quales muy más agramente el duque de Braganza don Ferdinand, tío suyo, le enbió suplicar, requerir e amonestar quisiese dexar el propósito que tenía, mostrándole quantos e quan grandes daños se le podrían seguir si proseguía lo començado, amonestándole no quisiese confiar de la fee de los grandes de Castilla, ni sus enbaxadas recibiese, ante dellos huyese como de bívoras ponçoñosas. Los quales, como desdel tienpo de don Alvaro de Luna oviesen quedado en costunbre de gustar la dulçe tiranía, ya no podrían sin ella bivir; los quales el quebrantamiento de su fee tenían por honrra, la infamia por loor, el engaño por prudençia, la trayción por magnanimidad. De la compañia o allegamiento de los quales no le paresçía otra cosa pudiese ganar, salvo que su gente leal aprendiese las costunmbres de los castellanos, e añadir a ellos materia

> para poder usar más largamente de su acostumbrada tiranía. Porque le suplicava no quisiese mezclar los leales con los que tales no eran, ny le pluguiese su reyno paçífico y quieto meter en guerra con los castellanos. (Valera, Crónica 8-9)

To make matters worse, not only was the Castilian nobility known for its treacherous character, but it was also extremely powerful. Elliot reports that over 97 per cent of Castilian land was in the hands of 3 per cent of the population, and that of that 3 per cent over half belonged to a small group of great families such as the Mendoza, the Guzmán and the Enríquez (113).

Ferdinand and Isabel's strategies to weaken the nobility did not strike at their wealth, but instead at their political influence. Their multi-pronged plan essentially put the Grandees on the sidelines of the administration of the kingdom through the re-organization of the *Consejo Real* in the Cortes of Toledo of 1480. Ferdinand and Isabel considered this arm of their government to be the central governing body of their administration with the responsibilities of advising them on the naming of officials and the bestowing of favors as well as serving as the highest judicial body in Castile and providing supervision of local governmental entities (Elliot 90). The innovation that Ferdinand and Isabel brought to the Council was its make-up, for they realized that in order to avoid the repetition of past mistakes, this body must exclude the grandees, so that the Monarchy's best interests would be central to the Council's decisions. To this end, it was determined that the Council be comprised of "a prelate, three *caballeros* and eight or nine jurists (*letrados*)" (Elliot 90). The representatives of Castile's great families who had served as dignitaries and counselors to the Crown were allowed to attend the meetings of the Council, but they had no voting power. The effect of this was that the

offices that had traditionally belonged to the greatest Castilian families were merely titles with no effectual weight associated with them, now that they no longer carried voting power. While the Velascos were still the Constables of Castile and the Enríquez, Admirals of Castile, these were now merely honorific because their prerogative to wield influence had been removed from the equation. Now, almost all military, administrative and diplomatic positions were given to "new men," who came from the lower levels of nobility, educated citizens of the towns, and New Christians (Elliot 90). The other side of the Catholic Monarchs' plan was to claim for themselves the Masterships of the Military Orders which had traditionally been in the hands of the leading nobles such as Alvaro de Luna, Juan Pacheco and Diego Téllez-Girón. These were extremely valuable commodities in that they entitled the *Maestres* to vast lands, large number of vassals, lucrative revenues and therefore power. As long as the Monarchy allowed these assets to remain in the hands of a few families, the kingdom would essentially be divided into three smaller states within the state. Therefore, Isabel and Ferdinand made their intentions clear in 1476, when the Mastership of Santiago was vacated upon the death of Rodrigo Manrique. Isabel herself rode three days to arrive in time to the Order's meeting with the sole purpose of having the title given to her husband. Although he strategically turned down the office for the moment, it was very clear what the Monarchy's eventual aim would be in relation to the Masterships (Elliot 88). They achieved the desired effect when the other two *maestrazgos*, those of Calatrava and Alcántara, were given to Ferdinand upon their vacancies in 1487 and 1494 respectively. All three were consolidated for the crown definitively in 1523 by means of a papal bull (Elliot 88-89).

In my estimation, what is truly amazing about these power plays on the part of the Catholic Kings is that the nobles, who had manipulated the previous kings' every move, accepted these reductions in their power. Were they weary of the many years of back-biting or just lacking a creator of intrigue such as Pacheco? Were they pleased with the direction in which the country was headed or could there be another factor involved? I believe that any of these is a plausible factor, but we must also keep in mind one important piece of this puzzle—that is, Ferdinand and Isabel's renewal of the efforts to complete the Reconquest. Both during and after the War of Succession, the Catholic Monarchs showed plenty of magnanimity, as one by one the great families returned to the fold. One thing upon which they could all agree was the desire to rid the Peninsula forever of the "infidels." Whether the Crown's rededication to this cause was a calculated move or a pious desire, one of its outcomes was to busy the nobles with what they liked best, war. Not only were the grandees fighting alongside of Ferdinand, whom they greatly admired for his prowess and courage, but he was transformed into their comrade, no longer their enemy. All of the nobles' energies, hatred, and in many cases, their fortunes were now directed toward a common cause--the conquest of the kingdom of Granada.

Throughout the course of the fifteenth century, one final thorn in the Castilian monarchy's side was the power of individual city centers such as Toledo, Segovia and many others. At times, these towns would withdraw allegiance to the kings, wielding their own power as best as they could, for whatever outcome they hoped to achieve. We have seen one such example already in the events of 1449, in which Toledo revolted against Juan II because of their displeasure with Alvaro de Luna. Elliot asserts that

"[c]loser supervision of the municipalities was an essential prerequisite both for control of the Cortes and for a more effective assertion of royal supremacy over Castile as a whole; for the walled cities and towns which dotted the Castilian landscape had many of the characteristics of city states and enjoyed a high degree of independence of the Crown" (Elliot 93). Isabel and Ferdinand sought to cut such potential events off at the pass by means of redesigning the position of *corregidor*. One factor that the Crown had in its favor was that the cities were much more concerned with the return of law and order than the protection of their own individual freedoms and rights (Elliot 94). Therefore, during the Cortes of Toledo of 1480, they were able to pass several pieces of legislation that improved their position in the cities. First, all towns were required within the next two years to build a town hall which would house all newly required records of special laws and privileges. In addition, hereditary grants of offices and positions were terminated, and new *corregidores* were appointed by the Crown for all the principal towns of Castile. These positions were of vital importance because they bore the responsibility of maintaining both administrative and judicial order in the towns, and yet they were specifically royal officials. They were also charged with the task of keeping any local clergy or nobles from usurping their power (Elliot 95).

Ferdinand and Isabel had successfully consolidated their power and re-established the strength of the Monarchy, but one major problem still clouded the horizon of their rule—that is, the constant murmurings and occasional outbreaks of violence against the *converso*s. It is extremely difficult to understand why two monarchs so obsessed with their piety would support an institution which at its very core was anti-Christian. This is

even more befuddling in light of the fact that their administration employed many New Christians, from top to bottom. As Netanyahu points out:

> [C]onversos were found in all departments of government, in all the councils of state, and among the personal secretaries, advisers and associates of both the King and the Queen. The numerous and broadening functions of these courtiers seemed so inconsistent with the establishment of an inquisition that the *conversos* must have found it hard to take the inquisitional threat seriously. It is therefore probable that even in November 1478, when the bull on the Inquisition reached the Kings, those *converso*s who were informed of its arrival did not believe it would be enforced. (920-921)

The fact is that the papal bull went unpublished for a full two years. The possible reasons for this delay range from the *converso* courtiers' influence on the Monarchs to the latter's preoccupation with other matters, but they are matters of speculation. As we have seen in this chapter, the violence against first Jews and later New Christians occurred only sporadically, but the underlying hatred which caused these acts was constantly simmering, fueled by anti-*converso* propagandists among the clergy and city leaders. At times, they would spread the wildest stories about the judaizing practices of their New Christian brethren, which the populace embraced with eagerness, only adding fuel to the fire of their ever-increasing resentment. When Alonso de Oropesa, the General of the Hieronymites, looked into the matter at the behest of Enrique IV, his conclusions were shocking. He essentially found that the *converso* haters' claims held absolutely no merit, and although he presented his case against these allegations with unequivocal precision, he also came to believe that his defense of the Marranos would hold little sway on their

detractors. He asserted that the very leaders of the anti-*converso* agitators understood that their movement was a product of deceptions and half-truths, intended to engender anger and resentment against them, which only encouraged what boiled down to criminal actions towards the New Christians. Oropesa felt that the basis of the animosity against the *converso*s was the intense jealousy that many Old Christians felt towards them, and he believed that nothing could be done to reason with a movement based on illogical and frenzied emotions (Netanyahu 941). But for every fair-minded clergyman like Oropesa, there were ten like Alonso de Espina, a Franciscan theologian, who wrote severe attacks against Jews and converts. One of these books was called the Fortalitium Fidei, a massive work in Latin, which was widely spread around Europe, often quoted by anti-*converso* preachers, and filled with accusations of Jews' and New Christians' crimes against Christianity. These incredible stories usually narrated a story of a Jew or convert who sacrificed a Christian child, to offer its heart on an altar or who stole and then desecrated a Host in a variety of outlandish manners.

The importance of the existence of such a hatemonger as Espina and of the willingness of the populace to so readily believe these horrific stories lies more in what it reveals about the moral condition of the society which not only accepted this as truth but also used it to engender hatred and violence toward both Jews and *converso*s. In a "sane" society such tall tales would be set aside as ridiculous, but even if we take into consideration the complex nature of the social illness that such prejudice represents, it is still difficult to understand why so many people would have blindly accepted these stories as true (Netanyahu 827). Their crippling desire to believe the very worst of the *converso*s must have overpowered any sense of logic and commonsense. The prejudice

against New Christians was really rooted more in the social and the economic realms than in the religious, primarily as a result of their rise in social and political stature on both the national and local levels. The Church and the Crown had, for the most part, protected the *converso*s' rights which only deepened the animosity for them as they rose socially. In general, a specific economic or social conflict would arise between small numbers of Old Christians and *converso*s, which would initially only create ill will towards those New Christians involved in that particular situation. However, the tendency for the resentment towards a few to quickly morph into animosity directed at the entire community of *converso*s reveals that there was an underlying antagonism which could be easily tapped into as a result of the slightest social or economic dispute (Netanyahu 973-974). This would clearly explain how the outbreaks against a whole group of *converso*s in any given city could be sparked by a very specific, small-scale conflict. It also demonstrates the transference of hatred that Old Christians could make from an individual to the group as a whole. This underlying prejudice was very powerful and only gaining in momentum. It therefore constituted a threat to the peace and stability that the Catholic Monarchs were actively pursuing. They knew that eventually the conflict between Old Christians and *converso*s would explode, and their decision to put the bull into official action on January 2nd of 1481, was probably a result of their determination of which side had the greatest likelihood of achieving a positive outcome.

If we take into considerations that one of the most pressing goals of the Monarchy was to ensure its own standing and security, then it is understandable how they would have arrived at that decision. Of their possible courses of action, the establishment of the Inquisition must have seemed the most politically expedient, even if it seems morally

inexcusable from a modern perspective. After all, the Catholic Monarchs were not the only politicians to see it as a solution to their pressing situation. All three of the most savvy political thinkers of the fifteenth century, Alvaro de Luna, Juan Pacheco and Ferdinand of Aragon, had come to the same conclusion. This trio had figured out that eventually one side of the conflict between the *converso*s and their detractors would have to give, and as all of them had at one time or another requested permission from the Pope to establish the Inquisition, it is obvious that they were in agreement about which entity would be on the losing end. In the end, it was only Ferdinand who had the political strength to see his vision through to the end. With his establishment of the Inquisition, he withdrew the Crown's traditional support from the New Christians and effectually became the standard bearer of the anti-*converso* movement, one which, as a politician, he realized he could not afford to confront (Netanyahu 1010).

It is difficult to find political fault with Ferdinand's move, even if one deems it morally reprehensible. For he was certainly no Cesare Borgia, thumbing his nose at all notions of moral rectitude; quite the contrary, actually, part of his image is that of a deeply religious devotee to the Virgin (Netanyahu 1031). However, Ferdinand was an extremely capable and calculating politician, much in the vein of Machiavelli's ideal prince. In Chapter 21 of The Prince, Machiavelli named him in particular as a king who had been able to grow in prestige due to his personal accomplishments but not without making an allusion to his "pious cruelty" in "driving the Marranos out of his kingdom and despoiling them," he continued, "[T]his example could not be more pitiful or rare" (94). As we have shown, Ferdinand was one in a long line of politicians, starting with Enrique de Trastámara, who was willing to sacrifice the rights of a marginalized group to

further his political aims. In Ferdinand's case, the implementation of the Inquisition increased his popularity with the masses and the cities while simultaneously adding to his and Isabel's prestige as the heads of a Christian kingdom. Ironically, the Spanish Inquisition could not have been a more un-Christian institution, using religion as a disguise for its true motives—persecution of innocent and truly Christian people, many of whose families had converted nearly 100 years before.

The secretive practices of the Inquisition made it practically impossible for its victims to defend themselves. They could not know the charges brought against them, nor could they face their accusers. One can only imagine the number of innocent people who were anonymously accused as a result of some old grudge or mere jealousy. And no one would even consider coming to the defense of someone falsely accused, as the do-gooder would immediately be under suspicion as well. Those that avoided the stake were paraded through town in their *sanbenitos*, clothing which marked them as having been found guilty by the Inquisitorial court. In addition, even after having suffered such humiliation, an Inquisition survivor was made a social outcast. It is therefore very easy to understand how an individual in these surroundings could become completely paranoid and obsessed with his or her social status, which could change from one moment to the next. I sometimes wonder if Ferdinand and Isabel had any notion of the firestorm that their tactical decision would unleash because it is almost unfathomable how two rulers, who were known for their justice and love for their subjects, could be complicit in such a crime against humanity that would continue to denigrate their people for centuries.

The purpose of this chapter has been to lay out the political and social situation of Castile in the years leading up to the creation of the novel Cárcel de Amor, in order to

elucidate the thematic layers of Diego de San Pedro's creation. From the events that we have presented here, one can sense the moral degradation of Castilian society from top to bottom. In the few instances that one of our historical figures attempted to act with any kind of inspired humanity, he was met with duplicity and treachery. Unfortunately, this was the *status quo* of the people of Castile leading up to the time that was to be known as their Golden Age, a moniker that, in light of what we know about them, is somewhat ironic. However, it is likely that the literary and artistic brilliance that this term denotes is the very product of a society struggling to come to terms with its religious, social and political identity.

## Chapter Two – Honor vs. Love

In the novel Cárcel de Amor the reader has the opportunity to experience the clash between love and honor as a principal topic that serves as the impetus of the narrative action from beginning to end. As Cárcel progresses, it becomes apparent that the two cannot co-exist on any level, owing to a variety of factors, which I will analyze in this chapter. Leriano represents love, King Gaulo honor based on appearances and Laureola is caught in between; inevitably she must choose her honor in order to survive. In the character of Laureola we are able to perceive her inner struggle, as she is forced to decide between her natural inclination to love or compassion and the societal and familial constraints imposed upon her to guard her honor as her most prized possession. San Pedro uses Leriano's death with all of its Christological implications to demonstrate that love would have to be sacrificed in a society that placed the value of appearance-based honor above all else.

The text's innovation does not lie in its employ of the topics of love and honor, for both of these had been frequently used material for generations of authors.[43] Neither was this author the first to use the "Law of Scotland" as a literary theme.[44] His genius, in my opinion, was his juxtaposition of the concepts of love and honor, making them mutually exclusive, and his portrayal of the consequences of this struggle. What we are able to perceive is a shift toward the attitude that any student of Spanish Golden Age theatre would recognize in the *pundonor* or honor-vengeance plays made popular by Lope de Vega, Calderón de la Barca and others. But before I get ahead of myself, we should briefly look back at how the particularly Castilian concept of honor developed in Cárcel's literary predecessors

During the Middle Ages, as social classes became more fluid, we note an ever-increasing concern with the protection of one's honor. In a work like the Poema del mio Cid (PMC) one detects the beginnings of the struggle between two conceptions of honor; one ascribed through birth and the other acquired through valor or virtue. These two views literally come to blows in the PMC, as the Infantes de Carrión, the representatives of ascribed honor, must face the Cid and his men, who stake their claim to an honor achieved as a result of their own merit. In the end, as we know, the Cid's point-of-view prevails, and we are left with the sense of the poet's opinion that honor without some kind of actions to support it pales in comparison to the class of honor that the Cid embodies.

Although the struggle between ascribed and acquired honor maintains a certain level of relevance to Cárcel, the preoccupation with honor in the novel is much closer to that of a *pundonor* drama. However, one must admit that the one treatment of honor really begets the other. If one's honor, whether innate or earned, can be won or lost, then it stands to reason that others' perceptions are fundamental in determining the level of honor that one possesses. Hence, as the notion that one could acquire or lose honor became more accepted, the importance placed on outward appearances began to overshadow the strength of character that the Cid represented. As time passes, the heroism and virtue which had made the Cid such a sympathetic figure in comparison to the Infantes de Carrión, evolves into an ability to increase in honor through the creation of a persona which represents those ideals without necessarily embodying them. As honor begins to equal image, the importance of maintaining appearances increases so drastically that it becomes an obsession, overpowering any ethics-based notion of virtue.

In the end, we are left with a society obsessed with an honor very similar to that portrayed in the *pundonor* plays.

The problem of honor became quite common among Spanish moralists and essayists of the fifteenth century.[45] They addressed and posed a variety of questions related to the topic: What are the types of honor? Who bestows it? How does one maintain or lose it? Diego de Valera penned an entire treatise on the topic entitled Espejo de la verdadera nobleza, in which he attempts to answer these questions primarily as a defense of New Christians' rights. Although Valera does not deny the concept of honor as value that one may inherit from one's ancestors, he maintains that without personal ethics, it can be lost. Valera therefore believes honor must be substantiated by morals, a goal that can be reached by whoever possesses sufficient virtue to warrant the reward of honor. He believes that it is the king's responsibility to assess who among his subjects deserves recognition and therefore honor, which would then take the form of the granting of nobiliar titles.

The king, being ideally honor's most perfect representative, had the power to recognize it and reward his vassals to the extent that they embodied that virtue. As mentioned above, this most often took its form in the bestowing of titles. The Trastamaran dynasty, which began with Enrique's overthrow of Pedro I, "el Cruel," was prolific in the creations of new titles. As we have seen in the previous chapter, this was a period of great political unrest between the Castilian monarchy, the Peninsula's other rulers and the Castilian grandees. In addition, there was sporadic activity on the Reconquest front. These battles and political intrigues served primarily as the contexts in which the monarchs would bestow honor on someone via the granting of lands and titles

as a result of the vassal's service on and/or off the battlefield. In many cases, this boiled down to bribing a noble for his support to the monarchy's cause, or a situation in which the former blackmailed the latter for certain concessions in exchange for his backing. In either case, these types of actions essentially deprive the honoring of a vassal of its original intent, which was to reward him for his bravery and loyalty.

The growth in size of the nobility was quite remarkable. I believe that it was one of the factors which exacerbated Castilians' obsession with honor. Not only could one successfully climb the social ladder by means of others' assessments of one's courage and valor, the increase in numbers also created a climate of extreme competitiveness and jealousy. Of course, this process of receiving honor is already present in the Cid, but during the fifteenth century we perceive a certain amount of criticism of the king's lack of sound judgment in these matters. Although Diego de Valera was not the lone voice of disapproval of Enrique IV's decisions in regard to the bestowment of honor, his negative opinions are glaring in his Memorial de diversas hazañas. One example is his commentary on the naming of the new Master of Alcántara:

> Y a Gómez de Cáceres dió el maestrazgo de Alcantára, que días avía que era baco por muerte del maestre don Gutierre de Sotomayor, las rentas del qual el rey avía lleuado fasta entonçes, por bula apostólica. De la prouisión de los quales no poco fueron maravillados todos los que lo vieron, porque no parecía preceder merecimientos, ni linaje, ni virtudes tan señaladas de aquellas que dinos los fiziese de conseguir tan altas dinidades, acostumbradas de dar a personas notables y de grandes merecimientos. (49)

We find yet another example of criticism towards Enrique IV in Valera's account of the nobles' pleas from the year 1460 to reform his manner of governing. One of their requests is that he "ternía yntegridad en el regimiento y gran prudencia en fazer diferencia entre las personas, y en el castigo de los malos toda seueridad, y en honrrar y mirar por los grandes, dando a cada vno según mereciese, y cerca de sí tuviese hombres notables, ancianos prudentes, de quien recibiese consejos, [. . .]" (61). The nobles repeat the same complaint when they ask that Enrique IV "en el dar de las dignidades quisiese acatar la calidad de las personas, [. . .] no dando lugar que los dañados quedasen sin pena y los dañados recibiesen ynjurias, como muchas veces hasta aquí ha acaecido" (62). It is obvious from these examples that many were less than satisfied with the manner in which Enrique IV honored those around him.

Another factor that stimulated social mobility in Spain in the fifteenth century was the rise of the *converso*s in the cities and at court. Whereas in the past Christians had sought to undermine the burgeoning middle class of Jews through legislation and pogroms against them, once the barrage of conversions that these actions set in motion came to fruition, a whole new class of New Christians came to be. In theory, as Christians, these groups should now have no restrictions placed upon them, allowing them to flourish economically and then socially. Their rise in wealth and importance continued relatively unencumbered until 1449, when the first *limpieza de sangre* statutes were created in Toledo. As the *converso*s' fortunes grew, their children became very attractive marital candidates for many of Castile's noble families.[46] The resentment of Old Christians in the cities against the New Christians was the principal cause for the creation of the Inquisition.

The workings of the Inquisition only served to deepen the preoccupation for outward appearances and to heighten the sense that one could be completely ruined by the slightest hint of impropriety. We know that once the Inquisition arrested a suspected Judaizer, that is, a New Christian charged with secretly practicing Jewish customs, he was neither informed of the charges brought against him nor by whom. Many times he would be tortured until he admitted guilt for whatever charges were suggested to him, only to make the torture stop. He was left to attempt to prove his innocence when he did not even know the charges until the trial took place. The testimony of the accusers was taken in private, never having to face the accused. Needless to say, few of the Inquisition's victims were found innocent. Those who escaped the pyres of the *auto de fe* were sentenced to wear a *sanbenito*, a garment which marked its bearer as having been found guilty by the Inquisition, for a prescribed period of time. In addition, in most cases, the guilty parties had their material possessions taken from them. Their friends and neighbors did not dare come to their defense lest they be the next to be accused. Under such circumstances, it is completely comprehensible that the society almost in its entirety went into a self-protection mode, which in turn beget a paranoia for the "¿qué dirán?"

This is the precise social context in which Diego de San Pedro wrote Cárcel. As outlined in the previous chapter, the instability of the political landscape and the sense of moral bankruptcy were two other factors that, along with the effects of increased social mobility, colored the social landscape of Castile in the second half of the fifteenth century. Under these circumstances, we begin to perceive the incompatibility between love and honor that San Pedro would portray in Cárcel. It is most obvious in the effects

of the Inquisition on Castilians, who must have felt compelled to turn their backs on any inclination toward love of their fellow man brought on by fear of being the next victim. The Inquisition, itself a supposedly Christian institution, could not have been more devoid of the kind of love that Christ and his apostles preached to their followers.[47] The final, successful creation of the Inquisition along with the previous attempts at its establishment were made in the name of protecting "true Christians" from the negative influence of the Judaizers or in an effort to "rehabilitate" those who had gone astray. However, we know from various sources that on the local level the accusations made were vindictive, self-seeking and slanderously untrue. Likewise, the monarchies that requested an inquisition (Juan II with Alvaro de Luna, Enrique IV with Juan Pacheco and the Catholic Monarchs) all had the ulterior motive of advancing their own power by gaining the often elusive support of the cities where anti-Marrano sentiment burned deeply. As we saw in the previous chapter, the most important influence on most politically active Castilian nobles during the fifteenth century was their own self-interest. Such a volatile environment created a vacuum in which love could not exist.

The marital practices of the fifteenth century (and obviously before) represent a social structure that demonstrates the incompatibility between love and honor in Castilian society as well. Propitious marriages functioned as a contract between two parties, generally arranged by the male heads-of-household in order to improve the economic and social standing of both families. In this context rarely, if ever, did love, one of a romantic nature, play a role in the match, being that the sole purpose of the union was to maintain and/or increase the families' honor or wealth. Even the Church classified any love (i.e. sexual desire) between husband and wife as the sin of lust. While the Church did seek to

enact laws which would keep parents from forcing their children to marry against their will, legislation established that any child who refused the parents' choice could be disinherited (Oostendorp 30-31). The strategic importance of these unions caused the males in the family to guard the honor of the female family members as a literal matter of life and death.

I have sought to demonstrate the incompatibility between love and honor in various social and historical scenarios in order to underline the pervasiveness of the problem in Castilian society of the fifteenth century. However, San Pedro uses the context of courtly love and the *pundonor* conception of honor to elucidate one of the central themes of Cárcel: love cannot survive in a society obsessed with honor that is based on appearances instead of on virtue. I will show how San Pedro clearly supports this theme in two ways. First, he juxtaposes Leriano, the archetype for love, against King Gaulo, honor's representative. Secondly, the novel allows the reader to experience Laureola's own moral and psychological journey as she is forced to choose honor over love in order to survive. I will now call attention to several of the characteristics of Spanish Golden Age *pundonor* dramas that San Pedro employed in his novel approximately 30 years before Torres Naharro's Himenea, which is generally considered to be the first of the genre. This analysis will demonstrate where Cárcel fits in the history of Spanish literature and ideas and how it contributed to the development of this subject matter that is so representative of Spanish Golden Age drama.

First I will analyze how San Pedro achieves the juxtaposition of a devotion to love with an obsessive need to protect the family honor. Although Leriano obviously functions as love's conduit, the impetus behind honor's cause is King Gaulo's need to

protect the familial reputation at all costs. Laureola, as I have stated, is caught in a dilemma as to whether to respond with kindness to Leriano out of love or compassion or to reject him totally in order to avoid the slightest appearance of impropriety. The truth is that although I believe King Gaulo to be honor's standard bearer, he and Leriano interact only slightly, so it is easier to see the contrast between love and honor through our protagonist's interaction with Laureola as well as in her own internal struggle as she ponders the best course of action for her personally. However, there is no doubt that her actions directly reflect her fear of the likely repercussions of violating her father's mandates regarding the maintenance of his honor.

Throughout the novel, love and honor are in conflict. At the beginning of the plot, we find Leriano in Love's chains and en route to the Prison of Love. While there, he receives a visit from the Autor, who functions as go-between, delivering messages between Leriano and Laureola, and acting on Leriano's behalf. As long as Leriano remains imprisoned, Laureola is safe. During the period in which the Autor attempts to persuade Laureola to free Leriano from the prison, to which his love for her has sentenced him, she makes it very clear that she understands her dilemma. In her response to the Autor's request that she send along a kind word to Leriano, as he is at the point of death from hopelessness, she states: "Si pudiese remediar su mal sin amanzillar mi honra, no con menos afición que tú lo pides yo lo haría; mas ya tú conosces cuánto las mugeres deven ser más obligadas a su fama que a su vida" (103). Laureola consistently repeats this dichotomy throughout the narrative: "Todas las veces que dudé en responderte fue porque sin mi condenación no podías tú ser asuelto, como agora parece, que puesto que tú solo y el levador de mi carta sepáis que escreví, ¿qué sé yo los juicios

que daréis sobre mí?; y digo que sean sanos, sola mi sospecha me amanzilla" (109-110). When the Autor relays this sentiment to Leriano, he responds, "[L]as cosas de honrra que pones delante conózcolas con la razón y niégolas con ella misma. Digo que las conozco y apruevo, si las ha de usar honbre libre de mi pensamiento, y digo que las niego para comigo, pues pienso, aunque busqué grave pena, que escogí honrrada muerte" (106). These words reveal the hope he has in the power of love to overcome this obstacle as well as his belief that love is worth whatever consequences accompany it.

After much debate Laureola responds to Leriano in a letter in which she promises him nothing but the expression of her pity for his situation. In this letter she communicates her fear that even this small token of compassion places her own honor in danger:

> La muerte que esperavas tú de penado, merecía yo por culpada si en esto que hago pecase mi voluntad, lo que cierto no es assí, que más te scrivo por redemir tu vida que por satisfazer tu deseo; mas, triste de mí, que este descargo solamente aprovecha para conplir comigo; porque si deste pecado fuese acusada no tengo otro testigo para salvarme sino mi intención, y por ser parte tan principal no se tomaría en cuenta su dicho; y con este miedo, la mano en el papel, puse el corazón en el cielo, haziendo juez de mi fin Aquel a quien la verdad de las cosas es manifiesta. Todas las veces que dudé en responderte fue porque sin mi condenación no podías tú ser asuelto, como agora parece, que puesto que tú solo y el levador de mi carta sepáis que escreví, ¿qué sé yo lo juizios que daréis sobre mí?; y digo que sean sanos, sola mi sospecha me amanzilla. Ruégote mucho, cuando con mi respuesta en medio de tus plazeres estés más ufano, que te

> acuerdes de la fama de quien los causó; y avísote desto porque semejantes favores desean publicarse, teniendo más acatamiento a la Vitoria dellos que a la fama de quien los da. Cuánto mejor me estoviera ser afeada por cruel que amanzillada por piadosa, [. . .]. (109-110)

This token of sympathy for Leriano's plight frees him from Love's prison but places Laureola's honor in jeopardy, just as she suspected it would. Thus, she asks Leriano to take care to keep secret their correspondence because her honor and therefore her life are in danger.

Upon Leriano's arrival at court, Laureola's fears become a reality. Persio, the jealous suitor, falsely informs King Gaulo that "Laureola y Leriano se amavan y que se veían todas las noches después que él dormía, [. . .]" (114). The king believes this in spite of his daughter's excellent reputation and despite the fact that Leriano defeats Persio in a duel, stopping short of killing the slanderer at the king's command. Gaulo sentences her to death and places her in jail until the sentence can be carried out. Leriano's and Laureola's positions have now been juxtaposed to some extent. Initially, he was serving in Love's prison with no hope of escape without some demonstration of love on Laureola's part. She appears to have granted him that out of her own pity for him, and therefore, not wishing to see him suffer, her response which liberates Leriano is at the very least tinged with Christian love and compassion. Although she repeatedly claims to have no romantic inclinations towards Leriano, we cannot be absolutely certain that this is indeed the case because her reaction upon seeing him seems to belie the notion that she actually may feel something for him. At any rate, her decision to respond favorably to Leriano while he is incarcerated stems from either a romantic love or a charitable one. It

is ironic that this gesture frees him but also spurs on the chain-of-events that brings about her own imprisonment. Her father's obsession with honor, in essence, punishes her for an act of kindness, echoing the theme that love cannot exist in a society bound by such honor.

Gaulo's actions reinforce the theme that love and honor cannot exist simultaneously on another level as well. He turns his back on his very daughter, believing the worst of her, basically denying his love for his own flesh and blood, in order to preserve his personal honor. After the Cardinal attempts to dissuade him from his chosen course-of-action, Gaulo responds that he cannot pardon her because:

> Si el yerro desta muger quedase sin pena, no sería menos culpante que Leriano en mi deshonrra. Publicado que tal cosa perdoné, sería de los comarcanos despreciado y de los naturales desobedecido, y de todos mal estimado; y podría ser acusado que supe mal conservar la generosidad de mis antecesores; y a tanto estendería esta culpa si castigada no fuese, que podrié amanzillar la fama de los pasados y la honrra de los presentes y la sangre de los por venir; que sola una mácula en el linaje cunde toda la generación. [. . .] Pues, más quiero poner miedo por cruel que dar atrevimiento por piadoso, y seré estimado como conviene que los reyes los sean. (132)

King Gaulo believes that where his honor is concerned, there is no room for love. This attitude supports the author's central theme that love and honor are mutually exclusive in the society represented in Cárcel.

In contrast with King Gaulo's obsession for protecting his own honor, Leriano, as a result of his love for Laureola, sets about to risk his own life in order to free her from

the prison to which honor has sentenced her. Leriano, and the Autor, exhaust all possible means of persuading King Gaulo to clemency and fail to achieve their goal. As a result, they use force to free Laureola, placing her under the protection of her uncle, so as not to raise further suspicion, which her presence with Leriano could elicit, no matter how innocent the circumstances. Subsequently, Leriano and his men take refuge in his fort at Suso. The fort is surrounded, and Leriano and his men are barely surviving, so they make one last effort to gain victory over King Gaulo. During the battle they manage to capture one of the men who had corroborated Persio's story, and he "sin premia ninguna confesó todo el hecho como pasó" (148).

It is only as a result of Leriano's great love for Laureola that she is restored to her rightful place at court. This scene seems rather bizarre for two reasons. First, because Laureola "fue recebida del rey y la reina con tanto amor y lágrimas de gozo como se derramaran de dolor; el rey se desculpava; la reina la besava; todos la servían, y assí se entregavan con alegría presente de la pena pasada" (148). Considering the harshness of King Gaulo's prior treatment of his daughter and his unwillingness to believe in her character, it appears somewhat strange that she is able to resume her position at court as if nothing has happened. The reality of the situation, as we shall see in our analysis of her psychological and moral dilemma, is that the one who must adjust to this set of circumstances is Laureola. Secondly, it strikes the reader that although Leriano has risked his life to clear Laureola's and hence King Gaulo's names, he receives no favor from the monarch. Quite to the contrary, we read that "A Leriano mandóle el rey que no entrase por estonces en la corte hasta que pacificase a él y a los parientes de Persio"

(148). How does one explain such ingratitude? We will return to the question in the following chapter, treating the political discourse in the novel.

After Laureola's honor is restored, she switches into a self-protecting, survival mode and cuts off all contact with Leriano. Without any hope of his love being reciprocated or even appreciated, he cannot survive. Her acceptance of and alignment with the laws of honor are absolutely incompatible with Leriano's love for her. We observe as Leriano, Love's representative, sacrifices himself on its altar. San Pedro likens Leriano's death to Christ's ultimate act of self-denial, even with his choice of his protagonist's last words "Acabados son mis males" (176). Leriano's final action before he utters these words is to shred Laureola's letters into a cup of water and drink them. Leriano ingests these letters, the only token of love he possesses from her, because "cuando pensava ponerlas en poder de algún suyo, temía que serían vistas, de donde para quien las enbió se esperava peligro" (176). This image is so rich that we can analyze it from a variety of angles. As I have said, these letters represent the only token of love that Leriano ever received from Laureola. He clearly senses the danger they pose for her if he leaves them behind. Therefore, they must perish with him in order to assure that her honor remains intact. This textual detail supports likewise the central theme that love and honor cannot exist simultaneously. In his article, Michael Gerli suggests an interesting take on the image. He maintains that San Pedro models Leriano's deathbed scene on the "*Ars Moriendi*, an extremely popular literary genre of the period, composed of treatises dealing with the art and craft of dying well" ("Leriano's," 416). According to Gerli, the purpose for this type of work was to "outline an etiquette of death and dying, [and to that end] the *Ars Moriendi* dwells on the psychological preparation of the dying person for

death [. . .]" ("Leriano's," 416). One of the principal elements in this process was the *Viaticum*, or last communion, and Gerli believes that "Leriano's libation is nothing less than an evocation of the *Viaticum*, and the shredding of the letters an allusion to the ritual fragmentation of the host into the communion chalice." He continues, "San Pedro in this image is cleverly distending the *cancionero* conceit on the divinity of the beloved and irreverently affirming Leriano's steadfast belief in Laureola's ability to redeem him spiritually" ("Leriano's," 416). Laureola's words represent her spirit, her being, and in that way the image suggests that if this action is part of the redemptive process for him, he still believes, even in death, in the power of love, much like Christ believed on the cross. San Pedro portrays Leriano facing death with both hope and dignity.

Some recent critics who have used a feminist approach to analyze the novel have judged Leriano in a negative light, viewing him as a materialistic opportunist or as a self-seeking lover, merely interested in edifying himself, with Laureola as his trophy.[48] It is difficult to accept these critics' reading of the work as exhibiting than a cynical attitude towards men and their motivations because this text in particular and the larger body of San Pedro's work do not support such an interpretation. San Pedro was clearly sympathetic to Leriano's plight, based on his portrayal of him as a steadfast lover, a hero and eventually a sacrificial lamb. The Autor's reaction to Leriano's death is certainly relevant to ascertaining San Pedro's intentions towards Leriano:

> Lo que yo sentí y hize, ligero está de juzgar; los lloros que por él se hizieron son de tanta lástima *que me parece crueldad escrivillos; sus honrras fueron conformes a su merecimiento*, las cuales acabadas, acordé de partirme. Por cierto

con mejor voluntad caminara para la otra vida que para esta tierra; *con suspiros caminé; con lágrimas partí; con gemidos hable*; [. . .]. [Emphasis added.] (176)

San Pedro, whom I believe we can identify with the Autor, mourns the loss of Leriano, love's perfect representative. In contrast with those critics who malign Leriano, it seems more plausible that San Pedro intended him to be a positive force in the narrative, especially if we analyze him in light of two of San Pedro's other literary creations: the Sermón and his other sentimental novel the Tractado de amores de Arnalte y Lucenda. The Sermón is essentially a set of guidelines to govern the lovers' behavior. It was created for the ladies of the court as an *ars de honeste amandi*, in which "San Pedro se interesa menos por cómo se puede conquistar a una mujer que por cómo se debe comportar el amante que quiere respetar las obligaciones de caballero y hombre honrado."[49] The most important principles for the male lover are to maintain secrecy: "Pues luego conviene que lo que edificare el desseo en el coraçon cativo, sea sobre cimiento del secreto, si quisiere su labor sostener y acabar sin peligro de vergüenza" (I: 174), and to be willing to suffer for the beloved: "E pues sois obedientes a vuestros desseos, soffrid el mal de la pena por el bien de la causa" (I: 178). Leriano remains true to these requirements but transgresses against one of the details that San Pedro includes: to resist the temptation to confide in a friend, acknowledging that "la passion comunicada duele menos" (I: 176). However, San Pedro comments that this is not advisable, because "quien a otro su secreto descubre, házele señor de sí" (I: 176). Nevertheless, in the narrative structure of Cárcel, the confidant relationship between Leriano and the Autor does not actually endanger Laureola's honor, and it functions in the text to demonstrate the compassion that the latter, and thus San Pedro, feels towards the former.

That Leriano represents the perfect courtly lover is even more obvious if we compare him with Arnalte, the protagonist in San Pedro's first sentimental novel. The list of Arnalte's faults is lengthy, as recounted by Keith Whinnom:

> He sends a letter by a page who, at his master's instructions, forces it upon Lucenda; he disguises himself as a woman and thrusts his unwanted attentions upon her in church, at mass, on Christmas Eve; he has musicians serenade her from the street; he insinuates his page into her household; he wears at a tournament a device which proclaims his passion; he forces her by his importunity in public to dance with him; he pushes another letter into her pocket while she is standing by the Queen and cannot protest; he follows her to her room; he has his page hunt through the waste paper thrown out of her house; he tries to keep clandestine watch on her from the neighboring house of his friend Elierso; he lies to her and pretends that he is going to leave the court; he uses his sister, Lucenda's closest friend, to press his suit; and, of course, he ends by killing her husband. (San Pedro 81-82)

San Pedro addresses these behaviors either directly or indirectly in his Sermón, but all of them reflect Arnalte's major flaw: he believes that because he loves Lucenda, she owes him love in return, without taking into account at any time what she wishes. He loves himself more than he loves her, which breaks the cardinal rule of courtly love, according to San Pedro: "¿Qué más beneficio quieres que querer lo que ella quiere? Haz igual el coraçón a todo lo que te pueda venir. E si fuere bien, ámalo; e si fuere mal, súfrelo; que todo lo que de su parte te viniere es galardón para ti" (I: 178).

San Pedro's attitude toward Leriano is of fundamental importance in determining the theme of Cárcel. If he maligns him as a self-serving misogynist, then his fate is really not tragic or heroic but a deserved punishment. I do not believe that the text defends such an interpretation. If, on the other hand, he represents his love as an ideal, his suffering and death take on an importance of much greater universality. The feminist criticism to which I alluded earlier faults Leriano as a representative of courtly love, which they believe objectifies women and is more about the edification of the male lover than his beloved. While one can accept that this may have been San Pedro's attitude towards Arnalte, it most certainly was not his intention for Leriano. This is only more obvious when we consider his use of the Christological imagery, the sincerity of the emotions of the Autor, and the relation of the character of Leriano to San Pedro's description of the perfect courtly lover in the Sermón and to the failed figure of Arnalte. All of these reveal an attempt on the part of San Pedro to create a sympathetic, tragic figure in Leriano. The tragedy of the honor-obsessed society in which he lives parallels the situation in which San Pedro sees Castile. Therefore, the death of Leriano/love supports the theme that love and that honor cannot co-exist in San Pedro's fictional world and intimates that it cannot in the real one either, a warning of the tragedy to come.

Beyond the juxtaposition of love and honor portrayed through the conflict between Leriano and King Gaulo, the reader is also able to observe the personal struggle of Laureola as she must choose between the two. Laureola is acutely aware of her dilemma from the very outset:

> [P]orque no podría el ser libre de pena sin que yo fuese condenada de culpa. Si pudiese remediar su mal sin amanzillar mi honrra, no con menos afición que tu lo

> pides yo lo haría; mas ya tu conoces cuánto las mugeres deven ser más obligadas a su fama que a su vida, la cual deven estimar en lo menos por razón de lo más, que es la bondad. Pues, si el bevir de Leriano ha de ser con la muerte désta, tú juzga a quién con más razón devo ser piadosa, a mí o a su mal. (103)

Clearly she understands that she has two choices: 1. respond to Leriano out of compassion in order to save him, leaving her honor in danger, or 2. not respond to him, which he claims would cause his very death. Choosing the latter would preserve her honor but could make her appear to be cold and uncompassionate. Leriano reminds her of this second possible outcome when he writes: "Por cierto tú eres tu enemiga; si no me quieres remediar porque me salvara yo, deviéraslo hazer porque no te condenaras tú; porque en mi perdición hoviese algund bien, [. . .]" (107). His attitude may appear harsh and manipulative, but later in the same letter he seems to understand the situation in which he places her:

> Pero quisiera que lo que tú havias de ver fuera ordenado, porque no ocuparas tu saber en cosa tan fuera de su condición; si consientes que muera porque se publique que podiste matar, mal te aconsejaste, que sin esperiencia mía lo certificava la hermosura tuya; si lo tienes por bien porque no era merecedor de tus mercedes, pensava alcançar por fe lo que por desmerecer perdiese, y con este pensamiento osé tomar tal cuidado; si por ventura te plaze por parecerte que no se podría remediar sin tu ofensa mi cuita, nunca pensé pedirte merced que te causase culpa. ¿Cómo havía de aprovecharme el bien que a ti te vinese mal? Solamente pedí tu respuesta por primero y postrímero galardón. Dexadas más largas, te suplico, pues acabas la vida, que honrres la muerte, porqué si en el lugar donde

van las almas desesperadas hay algún bien, no pediré otro sino sentido para sentir que honrraste mis huesos, por gozar aquel poco espacio de gloria tan grande. (108)

Laureola decides to take pity on Leriano but feels that she is truly in danger. She entrusts the outcome to God, because only he can judge the purity of her intentions: "[S]i deste pecado fuese acusada no tengo otro testigo para salvarme sino mi intención, y por ser parte tan principal no se tomaría en cuenta su dicho; y con este miedo, la mano en el papel puse el coraçón en el cielo, haziendo juez de mi fin Aquel a quien la verdad de las cosas es manifiesta" (109).

After Persio's lies and King Gaulo's cruelty place Laureola in prison, her attitude reveals that she has learned a difficult lesson as a result of her compassionate inclinations. She writes the following words from her prison cell:

> No sé, Leriano, qué te responda, sino que en las otras gentes se alaba la piedad por virtud y en mí se castiga por vicio; yo hize lo que devía segund piadosa, y tengo lo que merezco segund desdichada; no fue por cierto tu fortuna ni tus obras causa de mi prisión, ni me querello de ti ni de otra persona en esta vida, sino de mí sola, que por librarte de muerte me cargué de culpa, como quiera que en esta conpasión que te huve más hay pena que cargo, pues remedié como inocente y pago como culpada; pero todavía me plaze más la prisión sin yerro que la libertad con él; y por esto aunque pene en sofrilla descanso en no merecella. (127)

Interestingly, she does not blame Leriano for her situation, only herself and her circumstances. She seems to find some solace in the knowledge that if she is to die, it will be a result of bad fortune and with a clear conscience. Yet, at the same time, she

begs Leriano to fight to clear her honor before he concerns himself with her life, when she declares: "[T]e ruego mucho te trabajes en salvar mi fama y no mi vida, pues, lo uno se acaba y lo otro dura" (127).

After Leriano's successful defense of Laureola's honor and her re-establishment at court, she is more determined than before to distance herself from Leriano and the Autor. The latter describes her rebuff of him with these words:

> Yo, que con plazer aceutava sus mandamientos, partíme para Suria, llegado allá, después de besar las manos a Laureola supliquéle lo que me dixo, a lo cual me respondió que en ninguna manera lo haría, por muchas causas que me dio para ello; pero no contento con dezírgelo aquella vez, todas las que veía ge lo suplicava; concluyendo, respondióme al cabo que si más en aquello le hablava que causaría que se desmesurase contra mí. Pues, visto su enojo y responder, fui a Leriano con grave tristeza, [. . .]. (150)

She has learned not even to consider giving him any hope, which she communicates to him in her final letter: "El pesar que tengo de tus males te sería satisfación dellos mismos si creyeses cuánto es grande, y él solo tomarías por galardón sin que otro pidieses, aunque fuese poca paga segund lo que me tienes merecido, la cual yo te daría como devo si la quisieses de mi hazienda y no de mi honrra; [. . .]" (152) She informs him that she is willing to repay him for his defense of her honor with material possessions when she writes: "[T]ernás en el reino toda la parte que quisieres; creceré tu honrra, doblaré tu renta, sobiré tu estado; ninguna cosa ordenarás que revocada te sea; [. . .]" (153). Although we have seen that, from her very first communication with Leriano, she is totally aware of her dilemma, it becomes clear that after survivng her ordeal, she has

learned that her compassion did not pay, and therefore, she really has no choice at all if she wants to get by—there is no room for love in her reality. Her final words to Leriano leave her position on the matter absolutely clear: "No quiero más dezirte porque no digas que me pides esperança y te do consejo; plugiera a Dios que fuera tu demanda justa porque vieras que como te aconsejo lo uno te satisfiziera en lo otro; y assí acabo para siempre de más responderte ni oírte" (153).

The character of Laureola lives the experience of choosing between love and honor. Although Leriano is aware of honor's influence, he is an idealist; he firmly believes in love and its power, even in death. On the other end of the spectrum is King Gaulo, whose concern for his own honor is without a doubt his principal interest. Although some critics feel that Laureola epitomizes the typical *belle dame sans merci*, I find her to represent a much more interesting and complex character due to the novel's portrayal of her struggle to decide between love and honor. She is naturally inclined towards love as evidenced by her initial choice to free Leriano from Love's prison. Although she very nearly pays the ultimate price for this demonstration of compassion, she gets a second chance. She will not repeat her mistake, and although she regrets Leriano's suffering, she has now been forced to choose to stand firmly, albeit reluctantly, on the side of honor. In this regard, I find Laureola to be the most interesting character in the novel. As she grapples with the consequences of her decisions and her circumstances throughout the novel, the reader is able to perceive a change in her initial tendency towards kindness, one for which the reader cannot blame her. Because San Pedro's intended readership consisted mainly of the ladies of the Isabelline court, they could most likely relate to Laureola's dilemma, as they too were faced with the need to protect their

honor as their greatest possession. However, if we consider Castilian society as a whole, which at that time was in the midst of the first waves of the Inquisition, we can see how other readers of the novel could identify with her situation because like them, she was struggling to survive. In such an environment, unfortunately, survival mode overpowers concerns for love and compassion.

Without a doubt, the analysis of the struggle between love and honor in the novel is relevant to a socio-historic reading of Cárcel. However, the topic also naturally begets a discussion of the *pundonor*, many of whose characteristics are present in the work. I would now like to focus on these elements with an eye to examine Cárcel in the light of its position in Spanish literary history in regard to the development of the subject matter of the *pundonor*. Obviously, the topic of the *pundonor* is part and parcel of any study of Spanish golden age drama. Critics have studied these plays of vengeance, or honor killings, from a variety of angles, including analyses of the playwrights' attitudes towards such a practice, discussions as to whether such acts were a matter of historical fact, and attempts to discover the historical and literary precedents for the obsession with honor that would lead one to kill. Most critics point to Bartolomé de Torres Naharro's play Himenea from 1516 as the first manifestation of this literary theme in Spanish theatre. Although some of its characteristics also appear in later dramatic works from the sixteenth century,[50] most generally agree that Lope de Vega developed the theme more substantially and that Calderón de la Barca took it to its maximum expression. I intend to demonstrate that the majority of the characteristics of the *pundonor* are not only present in Cárcel, but also that the novel quite possibly represents the first manifestation of the theme in Spanish literature.

The most important quality of this particular concept of honor is that it is a possession more valuable than life itself. In 1916, Américo Castro wrote his well-known article "Algunas observaciones acerca del concepto del honor en los siglos XVI y XVII," in which he orientates the reader to the development of literary criticism that treats the topic and defines that particular notion of honor which would drive one to the point of the vengeance killings associated with it. Castro explains that "el honor y la fama son idénticos; la pérdida de la honra es análoga a la pérdida de la vida; [. . .]" (19). Ramón Menéndez Pidal echoes this notion when he states: "La deshonra se iguala con la muerte; la honra se equipara a la vida" (146). In Angel Valbuena Prat's discussion of the *dramas de honor*, he coincides with these opinions, noting that honor "está por encima de los bienes materiales y aún de la misma vida" (306).

In Cárcel it is obvious that for both Laureola and King Gaulo honor, which in their view is based purely on others' estimation of them, is their most prized possession, even more important than life. Laureola attests to this when she states: "[M]as ya tú conosces cuánto las mugeres deven ser más obligadas a su fama que a su vida" (103). She reiterates this same opinión when she writes these words to Leriano: "[Y] por esto te ruego mucho te trabajes en salvar mi fama y no mi vida, pues lo uno se acaba y lo otro dura" (127). Her father demonstrates a similar belief in his response to the Cardinal's petition for clemency on Laureola's behalf. King Gaulo expresses that he simply cannot pardon her because ". . .a tanto se estendería esta culpa si castigada no fuese, que podrié amanzillar la fama de los pasados y la honrra de los presentes y la sangre de los por venir" (132). It is tragic that the "culpa" that Gaulo himself has placed on her, believing the word of a liar despite her innocence, has the ability to dishonor not only the present

generation but ruins the name of the past and future ones as well. The power that honor holds over them creates the obsessive need to protect it as more valuable than life.

The second aspect of the *pundonor* that is apparent in the honor plays, as well as in Cárcel, is the idea that one's honor is not based on virtue but rather is constructed by others' estimation. Although it is true that many Castilian thinkers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, such as Diego de Valera and Luis Vives, continued to argue on behalf of virtue-based honor, Menéndez Pidal maintains that "la honra se gana con actos propios, depende de actos ajenos, de la estimación y fama que otorgan los demás," and that it was this vision of honor that predominated (146). Likewise, Castro describes it as "la consideración social, es el juicio que del valor del hombre forman los demás; [. . .]" (21). Similarly, Valbuena Prat, summarizing Cervantes' attitude towards the subject, states that to maintain one's honor, "es mejor parecer buena que serlo" (307). This is an interesting choice of words because they are exactly the same ones that Leriano uses in his response to Persio, his accuser. These characterizations of the honor portrayed in the *pundonor* plays reveal an empty cynicism, a falseness that apparently pervaded the society that produced these works. This is not to say that the authors of these texts agreed with this concept of honor, because as we see in many of the vengeance plays, the portrayal of the theme of honor functions as a piece of social criticism.

I believe that the same is the case in Cárcel, since it is clear that Leriano, Laureola and King Gaulo understand that honor is a social construct. King Gaulo states that if it were to be known that he spared his daughter's life, then he would be "de los comercanos despreciado y de los naturales desobedecido, y de todos mal estimado" (132). Even Leriano, whose sole mission in the novel is to serve love's cause, seems to understand

this fact. He begs the king to reconsider his decision to prematurely end the duel, which should have proven Leriano's and Laureola's innocence. He requests this because he knows that "[L]as cosas de honrra deven ser claras," which leads him to tell the king that "y si a este perdonas, por ruegos o por ser principal en tu reino o por lo que te plazerá, no quedaré en los juizios de las gentes por desculpado del todo, que si unos creyeran la verdad por razón, otros la turbarán con malicia" (120). Interestingly, the end of this quote alludes to Leriano's awareness that they live in a time of moral decay which makes the maintenance of one's good name even more difficult. We see that Laureola fears the evil times in which they live as well, when she comments to Leriano: "[N]o creas que tan sanamente biven las gentes, que sabido que te hablé, juzgasen nuestras limpias intenciones, porque tenemos tienpo tan malo, que antes se afea la bondad que se alaba la virtud; [. . .]" (153). These statements form a clear social critique of a society that is willing to believe the worst of others, is quick to judge, and is increasingly obsessed with honor. Therefore, it is comprehensible why one would become obsessed with the maintenance of appearances, lest one be judged negatively due to malice or ignorance. Although some critics have misinterpreted the intentions of both San Pedro and other Golden Age dramatists who treated the theme of honor, judging that these authors applauded this vision of the ideal, I feel that instead, they portrayed the concept in a similar fashion, as being empty, false and completely devoid of Christian ethics.[51]

The precarious nature of honor, which is a product of the value placed on it and the fixation with appearances, requires that individuals maintain complete secrecy regarding any possible breaches to their reputation. Castro explains that "[e]l cuidado más exquisito en el deshonrado es mantener el sigilo en torno a su ofensa, siendo así que

la deshonra crece con el número de los sabedores de ella" (27). Menéndez Pidal expounds on this idea when he states that any vengeance needed to clean the stain of dishonor "debe ocurrir antes de que el agravio se publique, a escondidas. Si ya se ha publicado, la venganza debe ser pública también. Mientras más personas sepan del agravio, más grande será la deshonra" (147). If one is dishonored, then, the best-case scenario for the individual is to act quickly and secretly to avenge the breach because, if it becomes public knowledge, it would be almost impossible to remove the resulting stigma of shame. Alfonso de Toro indicates that the resulting "'*vergüenza'* es también la causa de que se ocultara la 'afrenta' ('*mancha*') que pudiera producirse eventualmente" (86). Because of the precarious nature of honor, the need for secrecy is of fundamental importance. Laureola begs Leriano to keep their correspondence to himself. At the end of her first letter to him she writes: "[P]or Dios te pido que enbuelvas mi carta en tu fe, porque si es tan cierta como confiesas, no se te pierda ni de nadie pueda ser vista; [. . .]" (110). Later, Leriano demonstrates his mindfulness of the danger their letters represent for their honor because he tells the Autor that he does not want to include anything about his service to Laureola in a writing because of "el peligro que se puede recrecer si la carta es vista; [. . .]" (150). And later, on his deathbed, Leriano remains cognizant of her request for secrecy and thus determines to eat her letters, for he "temía que serían vistas, de donde para quien las enbió se esperava peligro" (174-176). As evidenced by these examples, both Laureola and Leriano are keenly aware of the need for secrecy in matters of honor. Although, admittedly, this need does not compare in intensity with the paranoia for clandestiness in such plays as Calderon's A secreto agravio, secreta venganza, it is still an important factor in the narrative strategy.

Despite Leriano's and Laureola's best efforts to maintain their correspondence hidden, Persio's false accusation and the subsequent challenge to judicial combat bring the case of their relationship under scrutiny. It is as a result of the public nature of the supposed dishonor that the situation cannot be handled in secret, and both Leriano and Gaulo acknowledge that any publicized dishonor must be dealt with publicly. Leriano establishes this in his reaction to Gaulo's refusal to accept the outcome of the duel as proof of his and Laureola's innocence when he tells the king that "las cosas de honra deven ser claras" (120). Therefore, he expects the Monarch to punish Persio publicly for his traitorous lie because he questions the reactions of others if he fails to do so: "¿Cómo sonará en los otros lo que es pasado si queda sin castigo público?" (120-121). Leriano is consistently perplexed by Gaulo's illogical and unjust reaction to the chain-of-events. The key to explain his confusion is that the king is much more concerned with his own reputation, a product of what Menéndez Pelayo termed his "egoísmo enfermizo," than with the truth, and he too expresses his preoccupation with the need for a very public punishment of his daughter. In his response to the Cardinal's supplication to spare her life, he says, "*Publicado* que tal cosa perdoné, sería de los comarcanos despreciado, de los naturals desobedecido, y de todos mal estimado" [emphasis added] (132). In the case of Cárcel, we see two aspects of the *pundonor* in regards to dealing with real or perceived affronts: one, that the need for secrecy is absolutely fundamental, and two, that once a dishonor is made known, the reaction to it must also be publicized.

Some critics, and in particular Menéndez Pidal, have discussed the vengeance killings associated with the *pundonor* as a necessary evil in order to maintain social order. He does not judge the murder of honor's innocent victims as a product of that

"egoísmo enfermizo" to which Menéndez Pelayo attributed them. Instead, Menéndez Pidal defends these actions as some kind of social obligation:

> Todo hombre, digno ha de conservar intacto el precioso patrimonio del honor social de que cada uno es depositario y guardián, honor que anima la existencia entera de la comunidad, para vivir su vida colectiva con elevado ánimo y virtuoso esfuerzo. No defender ese patrimonio es cobardía bastarda, es hacerse cómplice del atropello cometido por el ofensor en daño del honor colectivo, maltrecho en la parte al individuo encomendada. (151)

Menéndez Pidal essentially sees acts of vengeance as examples of heroism that benefit society as a whole. Similarly, Valbuena Prat esteems honor so highly that he states, "El 'honor' es su concepción más espiritual, es algo tan alto, que sacrificarse por él lleva casi la aureola del martirio. El sacrificio de una vida amada por el honor, es casi el sacrificio del mártir. Es el que está más cerca de éste. El honor exige víctimas, casi como el Dios de Abraham exigía el sacrificio de Isaac" (307-308). While these opinions seem.absolutely ludicrous, it appears that, by looking at the attitudes of the perpetrators of vengeance killings in Golden Age theatre and in King Gaulo in Cárcel, these critics are accurate in their characterizations. On several occasions in the Monarch's multiple defenses of his decision to kill his daughter, he justifies himself by claiming that the kingdom will suffer if she remains unpunished. He states:

> Perdonando a Laureola sería causa de otras mayores maldades que en esfuerço de mi perdón se haría; pues más quiero poner miedo por cruel que dar atrevimiento por piadoso, y seré estimado como conviene que los reyes lo sean. Segund justicia, mirad cuántas razones hay para que sea sentenciada. Bien sabéis que

> establecen nuestras leyes que la muger que fuere acusada de tal pecado muera por ello; pues ya veis cuánto más me conviene ser llamado rey justo que perdonador culpado, que lo sería muy conocido si en lugar de guardar la ley la quebrase, pues a sí mismo se condena quien al que yerra perdona. Igualmente se debe guardar el derecho, y el corazón del juez no se ha de mover por favor ni amor ni cobdicia, ni por ningún otro accidente, siendo derecho, la justicia es alabada, y si es favorable, aborrecida. Nunca se debe torcer, pues de tantos bienes es causa: pone miedo a los malos; sostiene los buenos, pacifica las diferencias; ataja las cuestiones; escusa las contiendas; abiene los debates; asegura los caminos; honrra los pueblos; favorece los pequeños; enfrena los mayores; es para el bien común en gran manera muy provechosa. (132-133)

Gaulo either sincerely believes, like Menéndez Pidal, that the defense of honor is of ultimate social importance, or he merely uses these excuses to rationalize his own personal vanity, which I believe is the true motivation behind his supposed sense of justice.

Finally, we see in Cárcel how King Gaulo is willing to take vengeance on Laureola and Leriano upon the word of a liar, and he does so with a cold indifference to his daughter's fate. Castro refers to this attitude as the "frío cálculo" with which the avengers face the task at hand (27). Menéndez Pidal disagrees with Castro, preferring to describe the behavior as one of "serena decision," because he feels the need to maintain one's honor is a social obligation that functions in drama much like destiny. Therefore, the murderer is a hero who must accept the fate he is dealt and face it with firm stoicism (149-150). Valbuena Prat points out that the wheels of vengeance can be set in motion

by the merest suspicion: "Esa idea puede nacer solo de una sospecha, o de algo que sea afrenta del pensamiento" (308). In my opinion, the combination of these two qualities of the *pundonor* give the works their sense of tragedy and are also crucial to understanding the author's attitude towards the notion of honor that these texts embody. In Cárcel, both of these characteristics are evident in the behavior of the King. The Autor tells us that Gaulo "[P]rimero que deliberase quiso acordar lo que devié hazer, y puesta Laureola en una cárcel, mandó llamar a Persio y díxole que acusase de tración a Leriano [. . .]" (114). He arranges the duel between Persio and Leriano, one which Leriano is dominating clearly, but before he can finísh Persio off for good, King Gaulo abruptly puts a halt to the fighting. Much to our protagonist's astonishment, the Monarch refuses to recognize Leriano as the victor and is determined to persist with his plan to execute his own daughter because of the testimony of Persio's cronies, even though he is reminded that these three men have horrible reputations for being "mal infamados" (131). No one is able to dissuade the king from continuing with his decision especially after he comments: "[Q]ue no menos devéis desear la honrra del padre que la salvación de la hija" (133). The Queen tries her hand at changing the King's mind, but she finds that "[T]an endurecido estava el rey en su propósito, que no pudieron para con él las razones que dixo ni las lágrimas que derramó" (134). The King's frigid persistence in his plans to execute his daughter reveals an attitude that is analogous to later *pundonor* protagonists, such as the Marquis in Torres Naharro's Himenea. In Stanislav Zimic's analysis of honor in the play and the author's attitude towards it, he emphasizes the importance of the title character's innocence as well as the cynicism of her Don Juan brother who takes it upon himself to judge her, despite his own dissolute lifestyle. Zimic contends that:

> [e]l hecho mismo de que se pueda considerar culpado a un individuo, sin tener éste culpa alguna, constituye para Torres Naharro una de las mejores pruebas de que todo el concepto del honor mundano se sustenta en un criterio falso. Para él, precisamente este mundo que se rige por nociones tan extraviadas está muerto al bien y a la verdadera honra. Además ya el hecho de que un hombre, con su juicio falible, usurpe las prerrogativas de Dios y pretenda erigirse en juez riguroso de su prójimo, constituye para nuestro autor una absurda, una sacrílega presunción. (185)

Zimic's subsequent description of the *pundonorosos* could just as easily apply to our King Gaulo; he believes that their behavior is a product of "una susceptibilidad patológica y, claro está, por el abandono total de la razón" (187).

There is one glaring difference between San Pedro's use of the *pundonor* and its later dramatic manifestations: Laureola's honor is restored to her, and her father accepts her back at court with open arms. In the typical *pundonor* play, the one who suspects his defamation would enact his own vengeance in the most secretive way possible, so as not to allow the slightest hint of his dishonor to be publicized. The victim would have no hope of a second chance like Laureola receives. The reader believes that Leriano will clear her in his duel with Persio because Leriano is clearly in the advantage. Having cut off Persio's right hand, Leriano is at the point of killing his slanderer when the king puts a halt to the fighting. This surprises Leriano because he does not understand Gaulo's logic. In theory, Leriano's victory would clear his name and Laureola's as well, because traditionally the victor of such instances of judicial combat would prove he was in the right because of the divine justice associated with the outcome. By demonstrating

Laureola's innocence, Leriano would be erasing the dishonor to Gaulo's name as well. Thus, the king's denial of the power of the victory is extremely perplexing. Although this point can be analyzed for its political implications, which I will do in the following chapter, one could easily suggest that the inefficiency of the judicial combat, at least in the mind of the king, is a step towards the *pundonor* vision of dishonor. In the PMC the judicial combat between the Cid and his men and the Infantes of Carrión has the positive effect of showing the rightness of the Cid's complaint and makes the higher quality marital candidates for his daughters possible. In contrast, in Cárcel the duel resolves absolutely nothing; therefore, one could say that the king does not recognize it as having the restorative power that it once had. It is true that Gaulo initially appeared to be willing to accept the outcome of the duel as representative of God's judgment; it was after all he who asked Persio to challenge Leriano; however, it soon becomes clear that, for whatever reason, he has no intentions of honoring Leriano's victory. This represents a movement towards the *pundonor* conception of dishonor in that the defamed believed that the blood of one or both of the suspects must be shed, and preferably in secret, because once his dishonor became public knowledge, even that bloodshed could not truly restore his honor.

I must acknowledge, however, that in the end, after the liar's confession, Gaulo does welcome Laureola back to court with open arms. She benefits from a second chance that later *pundonor* victims would not enjoy. This turn in the narrative would not take place had Leriano failed to confront Gaulo with the truth in such a way that it was undeniable. San Pedro uses this strategy effectively so that the reader can fully witness the process of Laureola psychological and moral development. Her changed stance on

demonstrations of compassion towards Leriano is much more akin to the fear of the female protagonists of *pundonor* dramas.

The presence of many of the characteristics of the *pundonor* in Cárcel makes it clear that this literary concept was already in development before Torres Naharro's Himenea. Even the ways in which Cárcel deviates from what would later become the standard highlights the evolution towards the inevitable outcome that the ever-growing Spanish obsession with honor would bring. One area of interest for critics who have treated the topic of the *pundonor* in the Golden Age has been the origins of the concept. These vary from the Moorish occupation to the chivalric ideals embodied in the *libros de caballerías*, Germanic traditions, Italian theatre, medieval legal thought as expressed in works like the Partidas, and medieval social customs, especially those represented in epic poetry of the period.[52] I believe it can be said that Cárcel is a novel that represents a society in the midst of a paradigm shift in its notions of honor based on medieval values to that particular vision of it that came to epitomize the Spanish identity as seen in the honor plays. San Pedro's portrayal of Laureola's transformation reveals that the novel was created in an environment in the midst of a change in its core belief system, one in which the obsession with honor was strangling any tendency to love. At the same time that San Pedro fictionalizes these changes going on around him, his portrayal of the tragic consequences that result from a lie, suspicion, the lack of trust and compassion, and the victimization of the innocence of Laureola and Leriano at the hands of such honor represents a literary innovation clearly marking Cárcel as a predecessor of the *pundonor* drama. The dramatization of this etiological shift reveals that San Pedro wrote Cárcel during a period of great social and political change. I believe that this novel functions as

a bridge between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance in both its context and content as it portrays the transitional nature of its vision of love and honor.

## Chapter Three – The Failure of Chivalry in Cárcel de Amor

The inclusion of chivalric material in Cárcel has produced a variety of reactions from critics. Some have judged that the political discourse that accompanies this thread of the narrative detracts from the sentimental nature of the work. For example, Pamela Waley criticizes San Pedro for his "failure to reconcile the courtly and the chivalresque elements in this story," which in her opinion "illustrates how little San Pedro was bothered by coherence and consistency in the structure of the novel" (263). Maureen Ihrie expresses a similar opinion: "The Cárcel de Amor is usually considered a sentimental novel—although an imperfect one, for it integrates the sentimental discourse with a political conflict quite at odds with pastoral aesthetics."[53] Both of these critics fault the work's inclusion of political material as taking away from the sentimental effects of the novel. Likewise, Francisco Márquez Villanueva addresses the same concern albeit from the opposite end of the argument, considering the political material as San Pedro's focus. He states that

> no se ha prestado la debida atención al hecho de que el núcleo narrativo de Cárcel de Amor, el nudo de la historia en el sentido clásico, ha sido planteado por San Pedro al margen del conflicto sentimental, que a lo largo de muchas páginas queda reducido a telón de fondo, a mero apoyo circunstancial de un relato cuyo centro de gravedad se ha desplazado hacia el tema político. (75)

The variety of material in Cárcel has troubled critics, both past and present, but this does not mean that the work actually lacks coherence. Is it not the responsibility of the critic to analyze all aspects of the text, in an attempt to reconcile them, so that he then may deduce how these components work together to substantiate a central premise? It would

seem that the text's ability to achieve unity, insomuch as all of its parts support a theme, should be the basis upon which its coherence is judged, not by the variety, or lack thereof, of its material.[54] In my opinion, San Pedro achieves this goal in that both the sentimental and chivalric components of Cárcel lead towards the same theme: a pessimistic view of the moral decay that takes place because of the failure of the chivalric ideals of love and honor based on virtue, in a society increasingly obsessed with honor based on the opinions of others.

The political aspect of Cárcel supports this thesis in its depiction of two very contrasting characters: Leriano, who represents honor based on virtue, and King Gaulo, whose obsession with honor based on appearances completely blinds him to the truth and furthermore makes him act illogically when confronted with truth head-on. Honor according to Gaulo's belief system is revealed to be false, blinding, corrosive and almost cancer-like in its destructive nature. In this chapter, I will show how this theme is supported textually. In addition, I will suggest various reasons why San Pedro may have felt that this was a timely message for the political climate of late fifteenth century Castile, and I will discuss how this theme reflects the society in which Cárcel was both created and read.

First, let us examine the text to analyze how San Pedro effectively associates King Gaulo with this negative view of honor, which, in turn, leaves the impression that San Pedro is being critical of this type of ruler. The situations I will discuss reveal the king's poor judgment, which in every case is a result of his morbid preoccupation with his own honor. As soon as Gaulo hears the slanderous accusation raised by Persio, he immediately believes him, "creyendo segund la virtud y Autoridad de Persio, que no le

diría otra cosa" (114), and his first reaction is to put Laureola in jail while he deliberates. The king's predisposition to give credence to such a serious accusation, without any real proof, is a sure sign of his sickness, especially considering Lauerola's lifetime of purity and goodness, which is mentioned time and again in the text.[55] As we shall see, Gaulo is more easily persuaded to believe the lie than to accept the signs of her innocence.

Gaulo asks Persio to challenge Leriano to a duel. What proceeds is, or should be, the typical medieval scene of judicial combat. According to Robert Baldick, this method of arriving at justice can be traced back to 501 A.D., when King Gundebald of Burgundy legalized the "trial by combat, or judicial duel" (13). The Burgundian law stated that

> whenever two Burgundians are at variance, if the defendant shall swear that he owes not what is demanded of him, or that he is not guilty of the crime laid to his charge; and the plaintiff, on the other hand, not satisfied therewith, shall declare that he is ready to maintain, sword in hand, the truth of what he advances; if the defendant does not then acquiesce, it shall be lawful for them to decide the controversy by dint of sword. [. . .] [E]very man should be ready to defend with his sword the truth he attests and to submit himself to the judgement of Heaven. (Baldick 13)

In the tradition of such duels, one notes that the outcome was believed to be a reflection of the decision of God himself as final arbitor. Another facet of judicial combat, as it developed during the Middle Ages in Europe, was that the rules of the game were consistent. Once the challenges had been made, and the conditions settled, there was simply no turning back from the inevitable outcome. This is evidenced by the example of a duel fought between two Spanish captains, Azevedo and Sainte-Croix, while passing

through Ferrara. The Duchess of Ferrara, supposedly the most beautiful woman, in mind and person, in all of Christendom, attended the affair which was presided over by a certain Monsieur de Nemours, who incidentally was so enamored of the duchess that he donned her colors of black and gray to the event. It became clear that Azevedo was to be the victor, and as he "put the point of his sword to the fallen man's throat and prepared to kill him, in accordance with the accepted rules of the duel of chivalry," the duchess begged Monsieur to separate the men. His reply, which confirms the static nature of the rules of the game, was: "You cannot doubt, Madam, that there is nothing in the world that I would not do to convince you of my entire devotion to your will; but in this instance I can do nothing, nor offend against the laws of battle, nor can I honestly and unreasonably deprive the conqueror of a prize which he has obtained at the hazard of his life" (Baldick 24-25). The purpose of these descriptions is to give the reader a general idea as to the tradition of judicial combat and to serve as a contrast to the manner in which the duel in Cárcel plays out.

King Gaulo serves as referee of the duel in Cárcel, which is only to be expected, given the situation. The battle begins fairly evenly, but Leriano soon gains the advantage when he chops off Persio's right hand. The significance of this detail should not be overlooked, for two reasons. First, the right hand historically is associated with good, righteousness, and justice; therefore, to be without it implies that the individual in question is evil. Secondly, in the culture of dueling, this was often the punishment for the losing party, if the combat involved proxies instead of the actual litigants. This punishment was considered just because the proxy was giving his word that the individual he represented was telling the truth (Baldick 14). At this point in the duel,

Leriano gives Persio the chance to recant: "Persio, porque no pague tu vida por la falsedad de tu lengua, déveste desdecir" (117), but Persio refuses to submit. It is the moment of truth in the battle when Leriano will kill him, consequently proving his and Laureola's innocence, but, to his surprise, King Gaulo interrupts the match at the behest of Persio's family members. Leriano is shocked by the turn of events. He cannot understand why the king would behave in such a way. He goes to the palace the next day and demands that the king give Persio the justice he deserves and that he restore both his own honor as well as that of Laureola. However, Gaulo refuses to do so. Not only does he send Leriano away from court, but he also still intends to kill his own daughter. It simply does not make sense that King Gaulo, given his own interest in the situation, would choose to ignore the result of the duel.

Leriano's shock is a result of the king's failure to follow the generally accepted practices of judicial combat. As Kevin McAleer notes:

> [T]hese struggles were to the bitter end. [. . .] Those lying in submission were allowed to plead for mercy, but even if clemency was approved by the victor, the overseers of the combat, viewing defeat as a heavenly judgment and proof of guilt, would frequently string the loser up at the nearby gallows. Vanquished proxies would escape with a chopped-off right hand; but their principals, kept off to one side with nooses about their necks, would be immediately attended to. Sometimes they would escape strangulation by being decapitated. (14)

This description of judicial combat reiterates the characteristics of the tradition, but also emphasizes why Leriano would have been so taken aback by this turn of events. King Gaulo stops the fight before the end, and even more striking, he fails to recognize the

outcome of the duel at all. St. Augustine's words: "During the combat, God awaits, the heavens open, and he defends the party who He sees is right," would not have any sway on the king (McAleer 15). It seems that he has taken God's place in determining which cause is just, or, could it be that he is not concerned about justice at all?

As a counterpoint to this situation in Cárcel, let us look at an example of judicial combat in a previous work of Spanish literature, the Poema del Mio Cid. After the affront of Corpes, the Cid goes to King Alfonso to seek justice regarding the dishonoring of his daughters. It is interesting to note that the Cid's and King Alfonso's relationship had been problematic throughout the poem. The Cid had fallen out of favor with the king due to the jealousy of some of the other nobles. Yet, the Cid had remained faithful to King Alfonso, and through his own military success had regained the favor that he had lost. Clearly, the Cid had reason to doubt the king's ability to act as an impartial judge, but he trusts him nonetheless to act as the overseer, the arbitor of fairness and the judge of the outcome for the three duels that take place between the Infantes de Carrión and the Cid's men. Cid's trust in the king's judgment is obvious because as soon as the arrangements are complete, the Cid returns to Valencia and awaits news of the outcome. He has complete faith that Alfonso will follow the rules of engagement, so to speak.

In each case the Cid's man wins, and as a result the poet declares "Por onrados se parten los del buen Campeador; / vençieron esta lid, grado al Criador. / Grandes son los pesares por tierras de Carrión." When the Cid hears the news of the outcome of the combat, he states "Grado al rey del cielo, mis fijas vengadas son! / Agora las ayan quitas heredades de Carrión! / Sin vergüenza las casaré o a qui pese o a qui non" (3695-3697). These words are important because they show that the Cid believes that God has judged

his cause as just, as has King Alfonso. In addition, the outcome of the judicial combat not only is the proof of this justice, but it also has the power to restore the Cid's honor. Without this restoration, the Cid would not be able to marry his daughters to the princes of Aragon and Navarre. As barbaric as these instances of judicial combat may seem from our modern perspective, they did follow a carefully laid out etiquette, and they did have the power to restore whatever honor had been lost because of the relationship of the outcome to divine justice. In our minds, the idea that military skill accompanies justice is almost ridiculous, but it simply was not so in the Middle Ages. Clearly, these duels had restorative power.

Why then, in Cárcel, does the judicial combat fail to restore Leriano's, Laureola's and King Gaulo's honor? The king's poor judgment in this situation has two possible explanations. One of them is that he is dissuaded from letting the duel run its course and then refuses to validate the obvious outcome under the influence of Persio's family. Leriano cannot fathom why the monarch shows such favoritism to Persio, given that they both come from long lineages of faithful service to the kingdom. He questions Gaulo directly regarding the matter:

> Si lo heziste por conpasión de que havías de Persio, tan justo fuera que la huvieras de mi honra como de su vida, siendo tu natural; si por ventura lo consentiste por verte aquexado de la suplicación de sus parientes, cuando les otorgaste la merced devieras acordarte de los servicios que los míos te hizieron, pues sabes con cuánta costança de coraçon cuántos dellos en muchas batallas y conbates perdieron por tu servicio las vidas; nunca hueste juntaste que la tercia parte dellos no fuese. (120)

Leriano's arguments have no affect on Gaulo's decision to disregard the outcome of the duel. It is noteworthy that Persio's family convinces him to take this course of action, which is in their best interests, but certainly not in his own, because Leriano's defense of Laureola's honor directly affects Gaulo's. Lerianos sees this and states it clearly for Gaulo: "[L]a razón por que despartirnos mandaste no la puedo pensar, en especial tocando a ti mismo el debate, que aunque de Laureola deseas vengança, como generoso no te faltaría piedad de padre, comoquiera que en este caso bien creo quedaste satisfecho de tu descargo (119-120). His statement adds to the debate the question as to why, as a father, Gaulo would not be relieved, out of love for his daughter, to see her name cleared. Logic leads us to the second possible explanation: Gaulo has no interest in seeing justice served because he fears that his own reputation will be damaged, if he fails to mete out a severe penalty upon his daughter. Just like the vengeance-seekers in later *pundonor* dramas, the male figures believe that the only way to restore their honor is through the elimination of whomever they blindly deem to be the transgressor. In this case, the unfortunate victim is Laureola. The two forces working to cause the king to act unjustly in this situation are his concern for his own reputation and his apparent, but unexplained favoritism towards Persio's family.

The text develops these themes further, as we see how poorly Gaulo reacts to the political advice he is given by the Cardinal, his own wife, the *Autor* and Laureola. The first to attempt to reason with the king is the cardinal. He begins his discourse with six reasons why it is in a rulers' best interests to seek out advice in difficult circumstances. The only one I will mention is the first, as it addresses the blinding power of Gaulo's obsession with his honor. The Cardinal says, "[M]ejor aciertan los honbres en las cosas

agenas que en las suyas propias, porque el coraçón de cuyo es el caso no puede estar sin ira o cobdicia o afición o deseo o otras cosas semejantes para determinar como debe. [. . ] Por cierto, señor, turbio y ciego consejo puede ninguno dar a sí mismo siendo ocupado de saña o pasión" (130). Later, he warns him against making such an enormous decision under the negative influence of passion, giving Gaulo the following advice based on the habits of the wise: "Y si de cualquiera pasión enpedidos se hallan, no sentencian en nada fasta verse libres" (130). He follows this admonition by reminding Gaulo that "no es todo verdad lo que tiene semejança de verdad" (131). The Cardinal also touches on a very worthwhile point: the king should consider the quality of character of the accusers, whose number has now grown. After Persio's failure in the duel, he bribes some of his cohorts, whom the Autor describes as "muy conformes de sus costumbres" (118) and men who were known for "gastar su vida en estudio de falsedad" (121) to corroborate his story. The Cardinal draws attention to the error of the ruler:

> Diste crédito a tres malos honmbres; por cierto tanta razón havía para pesquisar su vida como para creer su testimonio; cata que son en tu corte mal infamados; confórmanse con toda maldad; siempre se alaban en las rezones que dizen de los engaños que hazen. Pues ¿por qué das más fe a la información dellos que al juicio de Dios, el cual en las armas de Persio y Leriano se mostró claramente. (131)

He points out the monarch's failure to properly ascertain the moral fiber of those he has chosen to believe in a matter of life or death. He wonders why the king has chosen to believe them over God, whose judgment was made known through the outcome of the duel. The cardinal, failing to see the logic in Gaulo's choices, declares, "[N]o culpes la

inocencia por consejo de la saña" (131). The use of the word *saña*, which translates *viciousness*, *brutality*, or *anger* strikes at the heart of the matter—the cardinal attributes the king's actions to this flaw in his character, one which has blinded him to the truth.

The king's reaction to the Cardinal's advice brings to light the darkness of his own soul. He begins his self-defense by stating: "Por bien aconsejado me tuviera de vosotros, si no tuviese sabido ser tan devido vengar las deshonrras como perdonar las culpas" (132). By his words he demonstrates that he values vengeance as much as forgiveness, although his actions show that the former is actually more important to him. The king's attitude reflects the unchristian nature of the concept of honor that he represents, which is ultimately what spurs on his need for vengeance. He does represent a supposedly Christian king--he is after all being advised by a cardinal--but his actions diametrically oppose Christian ethics.[56] San Pedro is not only drawing attention to the falseness of this concept of honor but also clearly shows that one cannot serve two masters, so to speak. Although some contemporary writers (i.e. Diego de Valera in his Espejo de la verdadera nobleza) addressed the notion that honor should be based on virtue, it is not until the first half of the sixteenth century that the anti-Christian nature of the Spanish concept of honor becomes a fairly common point among moralists.[57] For example in Antonio de Torquemada's Colloquios satíricos, Antonio, one of the three interlocutors, addresses the problem, albeit with hesitation, because he fears that "algunos no querrían escucharme, otros me tendrían por loco, otros dirían que estas cosas eran herejías políticas contra la policía, y otros necedades," being that what he expresses is "tan contrario de la común opinión de todos los que hoy viven en el mundo" (537ab). Despite these concerns, Antonio goes on to state his point-of-view:

> Estaba pensando en la vanidad de la honra mundana y en el engaño que todos rescibimos en desearla y procurarla, y cuán mal entendemos qué cosa es honra para usar della conforme á lo que en sí es, y, en fin con cuánta mengua y deshonra procuramos honrarnos todos los mortales, teniendo tan grande obligación para huir dello, como lo podrá ver cualquiera que con claro juicio procurare entender el engaño desta honra fingida y engañosa. [. . .] ¿Pues qué cosa hay hoy en el mundo tan contraria á la verdadera fe de christiano como es la honra tomándola, no conforme á la difinición del filósofo, sino como nostros della sentimos, porque así la más verdadera difinición sera presunción y soberbia y vanagloria del mundo, y della dice Christo por el evangelio de San Juan: ¿Cómo podréis creer los que andáis buscando la honra entre vosotros y no buscáis lo que de solo Dios procede? Esta nuestra sanctíssima fe es fundada en verdadera humildad christiana, y la honra, como he dicho, es una vana y soberbia presunción, y desta manera mal puede compadecerse, porque todos los que quieren y procuran y buscan honra, van fuera del camino que deben siguir los que son christianos; y así me parece que es más sutil red y el más delicado lazo y encubierto que el demonio nos arma para guiarnos por el camino de perdición." (532-533)

These statements could easily describe Gaulo's vision of his honor. Torquemada not only touches on his society's misguided notion of honor, but he also comments on the unchristian nature of vengeance:

> Absolvió Christo á la mujer adúltera, y paresce que por este enxemplo ninguno puede justamente condenarla, pero los maridos que hallan sus mujeres en adulterio, y muchas veces por sola sospecha, no les perdonan la vida. [. . .] Las

> leyes no mandan sino que se entregue y ponga en poder del marido, para que haga della á su voluntad. El cual si quisiere matarla, usando oficio de verdugo, puede hacerlo sin pena alguna cuanto al marido; pero cuanto á Dios no lo puede hacer con buena conciencia sin pecar mortalmente, pues lo hace con ejecutar su saña tomando venganza del daño que hicieron en su honra; [. . .] Y no pára en esto esta negra deshonra, que por muy menores ofensas se procuran las venganzas por casi todos, y es tan ordinario en todas maneras de gentes, que ansí los sabios como los necios, los ricos como los pobres, los señores como los súbditos, todos quieren y procuran y con todas fuerzas andan buscando esta honra como la más dulce cosa á su gusto de todas las del mundo, de tal manera que si se toca alguno dellos en cosa que le parezca que queda ofendida su honra, apenas hallaréis en él otra cosa de christiano sino el nombre. (534)

I bring this material into the discussion to demonstrate that San Pedro's portrait of the monarch leads to question the morality of his obsession with honor, a question that would be posed by later moralists who were critical of the typically Spanish concern for honor.

Faced with some valid points on the part of the Cardinal, Gaulo attempts to justify himself on the basis of several arguments. First, he acknowledges that his honor is his primary concern because, if it were not so, he would be poorly esteemed as a ruler by his subjects, which would lead to "otras mayores maldades que en esfuerço de mi perdón se harían; pues más quiero poner miedo por cruel que dar atrevimiento por piadoso, y seré estimado como conviene que los reyes lo sean" (132). Second, he fears that the dishonor supposedly brought on by Laureola would not only affect him, but also the honor of his ancestors and of future generations; therefore, he argues that he is acting on behalf of the

good of his entire lineage. Third, Gaulo claims to be working for the sake of justice, because, as he states: "Bien sabéis que establecen nuestras leyes que la muger que fuere acusada de tal pecado muera por ello" (133). He furthers this point by arguing that "[i]gualmente se deve guardar el derecho, y el corazón del juez no se ha de mover por favor ni amor ni cobdicia, ni por ningún otro accidente," which in his mind serves the "bien común" (133). It is ironic that Gaulo supports his case with the notion that he must not show favoritism, given that this is precisely what he did in the case of the duel. Finally, the king addresses the cardinal's claim that he has violated God's will by ignoring the outcome of the duel. He states: "Dezís que deviera dar tanta fe al juizio de Dios como al testimonio de los hombres; no's maravilléis de assí no hazello, que veo el testimonio cierto y el juizio no acabado; que puesto que Leriano levase lo mejor de la batalla, podemos juzgar el medio y no saber el fin" (133). The difference in their points-of-view on the significance of the duel supports what I have previously maintained about Gaulo's true endgame: when his honor is in question, he has no interest in truth or justice, only appearances. By his own admission the duel has no weight because of the lack of an outcome, for which Gaulo himself was responsible. His interference could be attributed as much to the influence of Persio's family as to the king's refusal to acknowledge the truth of the matter. Gaulo's justification of his own actions demonstrates both his obsessive preoccupation with his own honor and the blinding effect it has on his judgment. I think, however, that the text leaves room for the suggestion that Gaulo's obsession has not only affected his ability to see truth, it has also corroded his character. His intervention in the duel seems to be a calculated political maneuver. Furthermore, although his response to the Cardinal attempts to defend his actions with rhetoric of

justice and the common good, it only exacerbates the negative perception of him by revealing him as heartless, self-centered and power-hungry, a perception that is underlined by the final words of his defense: "[N]o menos devéis desear la honrra del padre que la salvación de la hija" (133).

The next two to address the king are the queen and the Autor. The queen tries to influence him by appealing to his sense of fatherly love and to the political expediency of his chosen course-of-action. She reminds him of the "moderación que conviene a los reyes," she condemns the "preseverança de su ira," reminding him that he is a father, she offers herself up as a substitute for Laureola, if it is blood he needs, and she warns him that the murder of "la salva," which means *innocent one*, "matarié la fama del juez" (134). San Pedro describes his reaction with these words: "[T]an endurecido estava el rey en su propósito, que no pudieron para con él las razones que dixo ni las lágrimas que derramó" (134). His word choice reveals the king's heartlessness towards the queen's sympathetic appeals as a mother, and it demonstrates the extent to which he has decided to dig in his heels stubbornly, unwilling to heed the most logical advice from his own wife regarding the negative effects of his decision on the welfare of his own rule. The Autor attempts a different strategy, offering to refute the testimony of the corroborators through a series of judicial combats, but Gaulo reacts similarly. He cannot respond with logic; therefore, he petulantly tells the Autor to go away because the mere mention of Leriano's name only makes him angry. It is apparent that as Gaulo's frustration grows, he is no longer able to respond, as he did to the Cardinal, by justifying himself through a well-thought out, albeit ill-begotten, attempt at logic. Instead, he reacts with cold indifference to his wife and with anger to the Autor. San Pedro uses the emotional and

mental collapse of the monarch to enhance the negative perception of him as a ruler and a human being.

Finally, we have Laureola's letter, in which she makes the case for her own life to be spared. The reader might fully expect it to be a passionate plea for mercy, but what we find is a moving, yet well thought out argument that logically delineates the reasons her father should reverse his decision. She begins much along the same lines as the others, maintaining her innocence, which she tells him he would not have doubted, "si la saña te dexase ver la verdad" (138). Just as her mother did, Laureola appeals to the love that a father should have for his daughter, saying: "tan convenible te es la piedad de padre como el rigor de justo; sin dubda yo deseo tanto mi vida por lo que a ti toca como por lo que a mí cumple, que al cabo so hija" (138). She bases the remainder of her arguments on the negative consequences his execution of her would have on him politically. Her line of thinking supports the notion that it is better for a king to be loved than feared. Her argument contains the following statements:

> [Q]uien crueza haze su peligro busca; más seguro de caer estarás siendo amado por clemencia que temido por crueldad; quien quiere ser temido, forçado es que tema; los reyes crueles de todos los honbres son desamados, y estos, a las vezes, buscando cómo se venguen hallan cómo se pierdan: los súditos de los tales más desean la rebuelta del tienpo que la conservación de su estado; los salvos temen su condición y los malos su justicia; sus mismos familiares les tratan y buscan la muerte, usando con ellos lo que dellos aprendieron. [. . .] [M]ás experança tienen los beninos y piadosos reyes en el amor de las gentes que en la fuerça de los

> muros de sus fortalezas. [. . .] [P]or el escándalo que pornás con tan cruel obra nadie se fiará de ti ni tú de nadie te deves fiar. (138-139)

Laureola couches the majority of her self-defense in political terms, because she obviously knows her father's priority—his own honor. She closes her remarks by striking at the heart of the matter: "[L]o que más siento sobre todo es que darás contra mí la sentencia y harás de tu memoria la justicia, la cual sera sienpre acordada más por la causa della que por ella misma; mi sangre ocupará poco lugar, y tu crueza toda la tierra; tú serás llamado padre cruel y yo sere dicha hija innocente" (139). Laureola believes that her father's legacy will be tarnished by his cruelty, which will completely overshadow his own stated desire of being renowned for his justice—a claim that the reader can easily perceive, through the ruler's actions, as a pretense for him to seek revenge in order to preserve his honor. As San Pedro tells us, Laureola's guards held her in such high esteem ("tan amada era de aquél y todos los otros guardadores, que le dieran libertad si fueran tan obligados a ser piadosos como leales" (140)) that one of them ventures to deliver the letter to Gaulo, who reacts in a rage by lashing out at its innocent deliverer. This serves as another small but not insignificant signal to the reader as to the king's irrational and severe temperament.

San Pedro has successfully depicted the damaging effects of the monarch's obsession with honor and his need for vengeance on his character and mental state. Through the material relating to the duel, he was shown to have no real interest in truth or fairness. In the interaction between the cardinal and the king, San Pedro proved that for Gaulo, vengeance was more important than forgiveness, that his obsession with honor has severely impaired his judgment, and that he values nothing more than himself. The

queen's comments reveal how cold and calculating Gaulo is, while the failure of the Autor's additional attempts to allow the truth to be revealed demonstrates, once again, that the king does not value truth as long as his "honor" is in doubt. Laureola's letter touches on her father's cruelty but focuses on the political danger in which his behavior places him. After Gaulo's initial attempts to defend his decision to the cardinal, his responses degenerate into angry tirades, as he becomes increasingly frustrated when confronted with his own cruelty, injustice and illogical behavior. San Pedro's king lacks any positive qualities and, in the end, the reader judges him to be blinded by his obsession with honor and only concerned for what he perceives is best for himself.

Of course, I feel that this king's makeup has clear ideological implications, but before moving on to make these suggestions, I would like to comment on San Pedro's negative depiction of court life in general. He achieves this primarily through the character of Persio and those related to him. The entire polemic is a result of Persio's jealousy, which grows as he witnesses Laureola and Leriano innocently interact with one another at court. San Pedro says that

> Persio, hijo del señor de Gavia, miró en ellas trayendo el mismo pensamiento que Leriano traía; y como las sospechas celosas escudriñan las cosas secretas, tanto miró de allí adelante las hablas y señales dél que dio crédito a lo que sospechava, y *no solamente dio fe a lo que veía, que no era nada, mas a lo que imaginava, que era el todo*; y con este malvado pensamiento, sin más deliberación ni consejo, apartó al rey en un secreto lugar y díxole afirmadamente que Laureola y Leriano se amavan y que se veían todas las noches después que él dormía, y que ge lo

> hezía saber por lo que devié a la honrra y a su servicio. [emphasis added] (113-114)

If we analyze Persio's motivations, it is easy to make the distinction between the quality of his love for the princess and Leriano's. Some feminist critics such as Barbara Weissberger fail to recognize this distinction:

> The *honor* and *amor* that Leriano and Persio compete for so aggressively mask their ultimate goals: the wealth, property, and status to be acquired through marriage to a princess. This explains the importance of secrecy in the incipient relationship of Laureola and Leriano. Ostensibly protection of the princess's honor, it is actually a means of ensuring exclusivity of the suitor's access to her and, through her, to the aforementioned goals. And it is in order to break that exclusion that Persio betrays his friend's secret. It is an attempt to clear the way for his own suit, bolstered by the favored position his family apparently enjoys with the king. ("Politics," 311)

The problem with Weissberger's assertion is that the text simply does not support it. I agree with her characterization of Persio's motivation, but San Pedro makes every effort to show the purity of Leriano's intentions. The contrast could not be clearer: Persio's "love" puts Laureola's very life in danger, while Leriano risks his own to save hers. If Persio's ultimate desire is to better his position by using Laureola, Leriano refuses to do so by not accepting her promise of future financial and political compensation as reward for his saving her life. San Pedro portrays Persio as self-serving, playing a serious game out of petty jealousy. By contrast, Leriano represents the ideal of a chivalric lover.

An additional difference between the two young courtiers that San Pedro outlines is the basis of their character. He places this point on the lips of Leriano in his response to Persio's challenge: "A lo que agora conozco de ti, más curavas de parecer bueno que de serlo" (115). Persio is all about creating appearances with his words while Leriano prefers to rest his honor on his actions. The absolute falseness of what Persio says when he accuses Leriano to the king and then subsequently in the letter he writes, when he is forced to challenge Leriano to the duel, proves the extent of his hypocrisy. It is almost as if he were describing himself when he writes the following to Leriano:

> Por cierto, mal te has aprovechado de la linpieza que heredaste; tus mayores te mostraron hazer bondad y tu aprendiste obrar traición; sus huesos se levantarían contra ti si supiesen como ensuziaste por tal error sus nobles obras. Pero venido eres a tienpo que recibieras por lo hecho fin en la vida y manzilla en la fama. ¡Malaventurados aquellos como tú que no saben escoger muerte honesta! Sin mirar el servicio de tu rey y la obligación de tu sangre, toviste osada desverguença para enamorarte de Laureola, con la cual en su cámara, después de acostado el rey, diversas vezes has hablado, oscureciendo por seguir tu condición tu claro linage; de cuya razón te rebto por traidor y sobrillo te entiendo matar o echar del canpo, o lo que digo hazer confesar por tu boca; donde cuanto el mundo durare seré exenplo de lealtad; y atrévome a tanto confiando en tu falsía y mi verdad. (114-115)

Leriano's response stands in marked contrast to Persio's empty accusation:

> No quiero responder a tus desmesuras porque hallo más honesto camino vencerte con la persona que satisfazerte con las palabras. [. . .] [P]orque la determinación

desto ha de ser con la muerte del uno y no con las lenguas dentramos, quede para el día del hecho la sentencia, la cual fío en Dios se dará por mí, porque tu reutas con malicia y yo defiendo con razón y la verdad determina con justicia. (115-116)

Leriano admits that his mistake was believing Persio was his friend ("teniéndote por cierto amigo, todas mis cosas comunicava contigo, y segund parece yo confiava de tu virtud y tú usavas de tu condición; como la bondad que mostravas concertó el amistad, assí la falsedad que encubría causó la enemiga" (115)), but his error is really a product of the ideal he represents. His idealism can simply not survive in an environment characterized by hypocrisy and self-serving ambition.

The final characteristic of court life that San Pedro addresses is the unexplainable favor that certain families receive from the king. Admittedly, it is natural that the king would have closer ties to those families that had proven their loyalty, but in this case Gaulo continues to be influenced by Persio's relatives at the expense not only of Leriano but also of his own daughter's life. As I have already shown, the interruption of the duel at their urging completely confounded Leriano. Remember his assertion that his own family had always served the king with loyalty. That Gaulo asks Leriano to leave the court after the duel, so that he could "quitar el escándalo que andava entre su parentela y la de Persio" (121) is somewhat understandable. However, the king's behavior after Persio's lies are discovered and both he and his co-conspirators are dead completely defies logic. San Pedro tells us that "a Leriano mandóle el rey que no entrase por estonces en la corte hasta que pacificase a él y a los parientes de Persio" (148). These details paint a picture of favoritism and/or influence that can only be explained by the king's stupidity, weakness or corruption.

The political material in Cárcel, then, is comprised of two essential components: the cruel, honor-obsessed tyrant and the treacherous nature of court life. As I have stated previously, Francisco Márquez Villanueva has made a very compelling, well thought out argument for the case that San Pedro, being in Márquez Villanueva's opinion a *converso*, used this material to write a political novel to protest against the practices of the Inquisition. His analysis is particularly convincing when one reads certain passages in the "political" novel such as the Cardinal's advice to King Gaulo: "[P]ropiedad es de los discretos provar los consejos y por ligera creencia no disponer, y en lo que parece dubdoso tener la sentencia en peso; porque no es todo verdad lo que tiene semejança de verdad" (131). Another interesting passage that could possibly refer directly to the feelings of the Inquisition's victims towards their accusers is Leriano's response to Persio's accusation: "Persio: mayor sería mi fortuna que tu malicia si la culpa que me cargas con maldad, no te diese la pena que mereces por justicia; si fueras tan discreto como malo, por quitarte de tal peligro antes devieras saber mi intención que sentenciar mis obras. A lo que agora conozco de ti, más curavas de parecer bueno que de serlo" (115). It is also obvious that the king's completely illogical attitude could be associated with either the monarchy or the prosecutorial practices of the Inquistion itself. However, there are two aspects of Márquez Villanueva's study that need to be addressed. First, he supports his thesis by maintaining that San Pedro was a *converso*, basing this on previous critics' testimony. The truth of the matter is that there is absolutely no proof to substantiate this claim.[58] Nevertheless, one could easily argue that having compassion for the suffering of the *converso*s would not require being a member of that marginalized group, and it is possible to say that San Pedro paints such a compelling portrait of

Leriano's situation because he himself felt a deep compassion for the situation of the *converso*s. Ricardo Gullón describes these types of feelings: "Caridad es amor y ser liberal es sentir respeto por la persona humana y mirar al prójimo como reflejo de uno mismo, como reflejo de algo que está en nuestro ser y nuestro sentir" (110). Although Gullón was, in this instance, ascribing these emotions to Benito Pérez Galdós, I feel that they could just as easily describe San Pedro and others like him in the fifteenth century, who must have been horrified to see the mistreatment of their Christian bretheren. In fact, many members of the nobility petitioned to have their New Christian and Jewish vassals removed from the jurisdiction of the Inquisition. Second, Márquez Villanueva makes the claim that the "sentimental" aspect of the novel is a mere convention of plot, more or less a pretext for the political material. I feel that this opinion diminishes the power of his argument because his need to eliminate half of the work's material demonstrates a limited vision of the totality of the novel's meaning. It seems that one could use components of the "sentimental" side of the text to support his position. For example, Laureola's trepidation at losing her honor or fame because of an act of compassion and because of the maliciousness of those around her reveals a clear connection to the fear that Spanish citizens must have felt in relation to their own safety and the possibility of coming to their friends', relatives', and neighbors' defense. And, as I have already pointed out, Persio's accusations, which were a product of his imagination and his jealousy correlates directly to the motivations of many of the Old Christian accusers. Even the death of love's perfect representative, Leriano, relates to the notion of the novel as a protest against the Inquisition if we consider the tragedy that his situation symbolizes: love has no place in a society obsessed with honor based on appearances and

devoid of virtue. While I absolutely see merit in Márquez Villanueva's argument, I feel it comprises part of a bigger picture because the creation of the Inquisition, in my opinion, was but one component of the negative political and social situation in which Castile found itself towards the end of the fifteenth century. I believe that the novel uses the political material to paint a frank and pessimistic picture of the state of the Castilian political and social mores of San Pedro's time.[59] Leriano represents the chivalric ideals of a self-sacrificing lover and a man whose honor is supported by virtue. His environment impedes his success at every turn, and his death represents the failure of the ideals he embodies, not as a result of anything intrinsically negative about these qualities, but because the reality in which he lives no longer values the ideals he represents.

Stephen Knight has analyzed the Middle English Romances as a product of the political structure (feudalism) and social ideology (chivalry) that they portray. He challenges critics who have long viewed them as "escapist" literature to re-examine these texts in light of the culture and political structures that both produced and consumed them and urges his colleagues to explore their social function (99). Knight asserts that the romances were written for those who were directly in power and those who "were not in positions of power but accepted the values of those who were" (101). We can easily apply these concepts to the "target" audience of Cárcel. San Pedro wrote specifically for the Isabelline court and the pleasure of his own patron Don Juan Téllez-Girón,[60] dedicating this particular novel to Diego Fernández de Córdoba, seventh Alcaide de los Donceles,[61] but the novel would have also been read by "lesser" members of the royal and noble courts, people such as San Pedro himself, who served the upper nobility in a variety of offices and functions. In Knight's terms, they would represent the second

category of readership who, while not powerful themselves, accepted the ideology of those they served.

Knight summarizes the ideology of romance with this statement: "The romances confront problems seen from the viewpoint of a landowning, armed class, and resolve these problems with values felt to be potent and admissible. Threats and values are coded to produce a self-concept for the powerful and to present an acceptable image of power to those without it" (102-103). I find Knight's theory fascinating as it relates to Cárcel, because the novel seems to support it and yet negate it at the same time. Knight's article goes on to analyze several Middle English Romances to show how the competitive nature of the values of chivalry and feudalism, as portrayed in these works, helped to validate the landowning class's perpetuation of their own power by dealing with threats to it (105). In addition, the critic comments on the use of women as pawns in these works: "Time after time in romances that have been accepted by conservative critics as idealistic and courteous it appears that love-service of women actually functions either as a specific rationale for gaining their property or as part of a more general sophistication, part of the chivalry that concealed the brutal reality of cavalry" (107). As I have previously shown, Barbara Weissberger has used this same theoretical basis to impugn both Leriano's and Persio's motivations in Cárcel, but in my judgment, San Pedro successfully makes the distinction between the falseness to which chivalry can be reduced and the purity of the ideals that it represents.

The conflict that arises due to the threat to the king's, Leriano's and Laureola's honor is precipitated by Persio's treachery. In a typical romance, the judicial combat would resolve the matter, but the king no longer is willing to validate the nobility's

traditional means of conflict resolution, even though it is he who proposes it. The rules of the game are in a state of flux, and Leriano is forced to engage Gaulo in battle. San Pedro seems to side with the notion that the king's tyrannical behavior justifies Leriano's treason, an attitude which is undoubtedly "pro-nobility." This step finally achieves the outcome that Leriano sought—Laureola's life is spared—but in truth, he only partially meets his goal. Just when the king should be awarding Leriano, he sends him away without so much as a thank you. Once again, we see that the monarch's value system is at odds with Leriano's, which is founded on chivalric idealism. Gaulo asks Leriano to leave so that he may placate Persio's family. His actions are completely opportunistic because by now, the truth of Persio's lies has been revealed. Gaulo distances himself from the ideal for political expediency, hypocritically using honor as his pretext. San Pedro's depiction of this political situation lays bare the truth of the matter: the chivalric ideals supposedly embodied by the nobility are worthless, a skewed version that lacks substance and only pays them lip service. The chivalric ideal emptied of any morality creates an environment of slippery double-dealing and hypocrisy. Through the sympathetic rendering of his protagonist, San Pedro continues to hold up the chivalric ideal as a positive but clearly demonstrates the tragedy of its demise and distortion. The author reveals the tragedy of the situation they are in, but, unwilling to bury his head in the sand any longer, he paints a realistic yet pessimistic vision of the state of affairs.

San Pedro's negative portrayal of the political and social situation is easy to understand in light of the times in which he lived. From the historical summary presented in a previous chapter, one can observe that behind this front of honor was a dirty game of power struggle and treachery. This had been going on for generations, but

really worsened, in my judgment, from the rule of Pedro I "*el Cruel*" onward. I will mention just a few examples. The betrayal of Alvaro de Luna by Juan II is extremely compelling. No matter how you judge the king's favorite, who was certainly no Boy Scout, it seems that he wholeheartedly believed in the cause of strengthening the monarchy as a cure for the kingdom's ills. He spent his entire life tirelessly bolstering Juan II's position as ruler, and the monarch coldly repaid him for the service by having him executed, after certain nobles and the queen, envious of Alvaro de Luna's position and wary of his project, persuaded the king to do so.

San Pedro does not excuse the nobility's complicity in the problem, as attested by his characterization of Persio and his corroborators. The chronicles of the reign of Enrique IV are replete with tales of shameless ploys and manipulation orchestrated by the members of Castile's highest nobility, especially once the ineptitude of their king became apparent. Of particular relevance is the entire Beltraneja affair, given that Enrique agreed to declare his own daughter's illegitimacy, naming first Alfonso and then Isabel as his successors, provided that he could maintain his rule in the short term. Of course, this was all arranged by Juan Pacheco, who, upon seeing that Isabel would not be so easily controlled, convinced Enrique to retract his initial declaration about his daughter. The entire matter may have been a product of certain nobles' jealousy as they observed Beltrán de la Cueva, the queen's supposed lover and therefore father of the princess, rise in favor with the king. Shortly after Enrique awarded Don Beltrán the Mastership of Santiago, the accusations of adultery began to fly.

The events leading up to the reign of the Catholic Monarchs would have been important in the formulation of San Pedro's world view, but their rise to power and the

implementation of their political program served as the backdrop for the novel's conception. Historians are still debating the correctness of the glorification of Isabel and Ferdinand as saviors of Spain. No matter your opinion of their ethics as rulers, it cannot be denied that they thoroughly understood the challenges they faced and that they were extremely astute in their approach to consolidating and maintaining their power. Their success was a function of their political acumen, which allowed them to clearly identify problems, formulate solutions and to carry them out with ruthless determination. J.H. Elliot's list of the political stratagems of the Catholic Monarchs includes: (1) restoring order, (2) curbing the power of the cities, (3) re-invigorating the system of justice through their active participation, (4) gaining control over and reforming the Church, and (5) diminishing the influence of the aristocracy on the monarchy (86-110). The deteriorated state of anarchy that had ruled the land during the reign of Enrique IV and the War of Succession facilitated Ferdinand's and Isabel's task or restoring order in that Castilians were willing to sacrifice some of their independence in the hope that peace and prosperity would return (Elliot 95). This was particularly true of their assertion of control over the cities and their re-establishment of the *Hermandades*, which acted as police force and judicial tribunal to combat the rampant banditry that had taken over (Elliot 86-88). Their personal participation in the judicial system won them many fans amongst the people, and, according to Elliot, is just one example of the principal reason for their success: "their uncanny skill in identifying the interests of the community of the realm with those of the Crown" (98). By incorporating the will of the people into their own political program they were able to create the feeling that the nation was working together to

rebuild, but this also meant that government was simultaneously impacted by the royal and popular will (Elliot 98-99).

In this same category falls the creation of the Inquisition, "a tragedy in which the sovereigns themselves both led, and were led by, their people" (Elliot 106). As I outlined in the historical background, the Jews and *conversos* both had endured an ever-growing contempt, as a result of the financial functions as money-lenders and tax collectors they fulfilled in society. The enmity towards them only grew as these groups bettered themselves financially, and thus socially. The establishment of the Inquisition shored up support for Ferdinand and Isabel among many city dwellers and the rural, uneducated populace. Benzion Netanyahu notes that Ferdinand, who seemed to be the driving force behind the project, was only one of three major political players of the fifteenth century, the other two being Luna and Pachecho, to see the inevitability of the explosion of the conflict between the *conversos* and their enemies. All three understood which would be the losing party—the papal bull for the establishment of the Inquisition was, after all, requested and granted on multiple occasions. Netanyahu maintains that it was Ferdinand alone who personally possessed the political clout to transform it into a reality (1010). It must have surprised the *conversos*, who had enjoyed strong protection in the Catholic Monarch's administration, to see the bull of 1478 signed into law in 1481. They had certainly experienced the threat of the Inquisition in the past, but now their fears were taking shape.

The *conversos* underestimated the strength of Ferdinand's political resolve to not just maintain but also increase his cache of power. Netanyahu notes that Ferdinand viewed politics as a science that had no room for moral absolutes. As a ruler, it was

necessary for him to suppress these judgmental instincts to make the best decisions for his political success (1031). It was no wonder that Machiavelli chose Ferdinand as an exemplary prince. Netanyahu goes on to observe that Ferdinand was different from Cesare Borgia, who thumbed his nose at any notion of morality. On the contrary, Ferdinand made every effort to appear moral and devout, because he understood how important this was to those from whom he garnered support (1032). The creation of the Inquisition (like the expulsion of the Jews and the campaigns against the Moors) ensured the Sovereigns' popularity and fostered the growth of a national unity founded on religious fervor (Elliot 108). As I have noted, King Gaulo's treatment of Leriano bears more than just a slight resemblance to the Catholic Monarch's treatment of the *converso*s, which although was outwardly religious in motivation, could not have been further from being sincerely Chirstian. Seen from this point-of-view, it is apparent that San Pedro's Gaulo shared some commonalities with Ferdinand's ability to set aside morality to better himself politically, but in truth, this comparison could be made between the fictional monarch and any number of fifteenth century Castilian political players. In his discussion of Benito Pérez Galdós' Episodios nacionales, Ricardo Gullón describes the fusion of the historical and imaginary as:

> novelas históricas o de narraciones, como las de Galdós, en donde fantasia e historia concurren a producir un producto en apariencia híbrido de lo uno y de lo otro, cruce singular de lo imaginativo y de lo histórico. Digo en apariencia, pues mirando con atención la textura narrativa se descubren en ella ambos elementos: lo histórico como materia integrante de la novela; lo imaginativo, como agente transformador de esa materia en sustancia novelesca. ("La historia," 403)

Cárcel would fall into this same genre of works that comments on the political and social climate of its time through their novelization.

The most substantial challenge that the new monarchy faced, in my opinion, was the taming of the nobility. Isabel and Ferdinand carried out a two-pronged approach to achieve this end. First, through the Cortes of Toledo of 1480, they brought about legislation that restructured the *Consejo Real*. It would now be comprised of "a prelate, three caballeros, and eight or nine jurists (*letrados*)" (Elliot 90). The magnates, who had used this administrative body to manipulate previous administrations, could now attend meetings and voice their opinions, but they had no actual voting power. Their offices were not done away with in name, but now were essentially devoid of real influence. In addition, the Sovereigns no longer primarily filled military commands and political and administrative posts with members of the old noble families, opting instead to confer them "upon 'new men': members of the lesser nobility and gentry, townsmen, and *conversos* (converted Jews)" (Elliot 90). The nobility was essentially left on the outside looking in as the Catholic Monarchs broke with tradition by expertly selecting those men who they knew would serve the monarchy's interests rather than their own.

The other aspect of their plan to subjugate the nobility to the royal will was to turn their attention to the campaigns against the remaining Moorish kingdoms in the Peninsula. This activity served to busy the bellicose nobles but also gave them a unity of purpose with the sovereigns, an effective strategy to heal wounds left over from the War of Succession. Juan Téllez-Girón, San Pedro's employer, and his twin brother Rodrigo fit this description as they had supported the Beltraneja cause until May of 1476, but when called upon to further the Reconquest in 1482, they were both more than willing

participants. Rodrigo gained renown for his fearlessness in a very short period of time, although he died in at the siege of Loja in 1482. The death of his twin only spurred on Don Juan to support the cause with all he had, expending his own men and money with reckless abandon (Whinnom, San Pedro 24). On January 2nd, 1492, it was Don Juan who accompanied Ferdinand and Isabel into Granada, serving as their *Notorio Mayor*.[62] Whinnom believes that it is very likely that San Pedro would have accompanied Don Juan throughout this period, which coincides with the composition of Cárcel (San Pedro 25).

Shortly after the capitulation of Granada, Don Juan retired completely from public life, returning to his estates in Andalusia. I believe it is quite noteworthy that from that point he changed his focus completely, turning away from worldly pursuits, preferring to spend his time on acts of piety, such as helping the poor with what remained of his fortune. Whinnom attributes this about face to the influence of his wife, Doña Leonor de la Vega, a deeply religious woman (San Pedro 27). This transformation apparently affected San Pedro as well in that in his later writing he refers to his previous works as "obras vanas" and "escrituras livianas" (III: 275). It is during this time that he composed Desprecio de la Fortuna. This poem differs from others that focus on the fickle nature of Fortune. San Pedro does not fault Fortune for the impact she has on men's lives, placing the blame instead on those who through their own ambition make themselves susceptible to Fortune's whims. Having dedicated the poem to Don Juan, he prescribes being satisfied with what little one may have in order to avoid the vanity of her traps.[63] The withdrawal from court life of both San Pedro and his patron may very well be a product of the growing pessimism that our author expresses towards that life in Cárcel.

To summarize, I believe the political material in Cárcel reflects an identity crisis on the part of the nobility through the failure of the ideals that have long been associated with their class. This pessimistic outlook is not the result of any single situation, but more generally, the product of a century of ineffective leadership and treacherous political wrangling in which they took center stage. Add to that backdrop the changes brought about by the incipient monarchy of Ferdinand and Isabel, and it is understandable that they would have suffered from such a crisis of identity. According to Johan Huizinga, the late Middle Ages was a period in which the aristocratic life was idealized in order to combat the misery of reality, but in truth these noble life forms were little more than a veneer (39). Evidence of this contrast can be found in the chroniclers who, according to Huizinga, began their works with declarations about the glory of knightly virtue, but then, when it came to reporting the events they witnessed, their "journalistic pen continuously [wrote] a record of treason and cruelty, crafty greed and dominance, of a profession of arms that had become entirely devoted to the making of profit" (72). Even as the ideal decayed in the face of reality, it continued to maintain a hold on society. As Huizinga notes: "The degeneration of spirituality, the decay of chivalric virtue, could thus be lamented without abandoning even a small part of the ideal image; the sins of men may prevent the realization of the ideal, but the ideal remains the basis and the guide for social thought" (63). Huizinga claims that literature only exacerbated the situation by using the chivalric ideal to create an escape from reality, but I find that, at least in the case of Cárcel, the opposite effect is achieved. Without abandoning the beauty of the chivalric ideals, San Pedro demonstrates that they are no longer functional. Leriano, who represents the perfection of those values, is rejected by the king and the princess.

Through no fault of his own, he is a complete failure both politically and romantically, and upon realizing that he has no place in that world, he gives up the fight and allows himself to die as a martyr.

## Chapter Four – Metafiction in Cárcel de Amor

The participation of the Autor character in Cárcel de Amor has drawn the attention of more than one critic of Spanish sentimental romance. In this chapter, I will add to the discussion of the topic in light of current metafictional literary theory. This analysis will bring to light two important effects of San Pedro's decision to insert the Autor figure in the text. First, I will show that San Pedro's specific narrative choices support the novel's representation of an unsteady world that no longer values honor and love based on the chivalric ethic. The Autor, as Leriano's representative, struggles to make sense of the fictional yet realistic world he inhabits. He is often confused because the literary model on which he and Leriano base their world view no longer functions in the "real" world. Second, most of the literary theory of the last 30 years that treats the topic of metafiction points back to Don Quixote as the beginning of the genre. I believe that one could make the claim that Cárcel represents an important step in the direction of narrative that is self-aware of its status as literary product and that employs metanarrative techniques to cause the readers to question the fictive constructs of their own reality.

The first step in this process, however, is to outline how previous criticism has attempted to explain the presence of the Autor character in the novel. The first to treat the topic specifically was Bruce Wardropper, in his article "Allegory and the Role of El Autor in the Cárcel de Amor." Wardropper addresses Menéndez Pelayo's claim that sentimental novels are essentially autobiographical,[64] by suggesting that the work, which moves from pure allegory to reality, allows San Pedro to create a "vision" in which "El Autor is not to be identified with San Pedro, but with San Pedro's dream representation of himself. The vision may well be a passing in review of a momentous love experience in

San Pedro's life, with Leriano representing El Autor at an earlier period of his life. Both El Autor and Leriano would thus be pseudo-San Pedros" ("Allegory," 41). Although it is fair to say that any work of fiction is informed by the author's personal experience, it seems to me a matter of pure speculation to make such a claim, in particular because we know so little about his life, and absolutely nothing about his love life.

Peter Dunn took on the subject next in his 1979 article "Narrator as Character in Cárcel de Amor," which makes some valuable points about the function of the Autor in the novel but that, in my opinion, fails to develop them fully. His comparison of the Autor characters in both Cárcel and San Pedro's other sentimental romance Tractado de amores de Arnalte y Lucenda is particularly interesting in that Dunn points out the degree of emotional participation of the Autor in both works. In Arnalte, he functions as the relater of the tale as told to him by Arnalte himself. The effect is the creation of distance between the Autor and the events narrated, which makes "possible a critique of the lover's conduct" (190). Dunn explains that from beginning to end quite the opposite is true in Cárcel, as the Autor "bears witness not with detachment inviting his audience's polite applause, but with unreserved participation" (190). Another worthwhile point that Dunn makes is that Cárcel narrates a series of dilemmas, ranging from the Autor's decision whether to assist Leriano, at the beginning, to whether he should share Laureola's farewell letter with his protagonist. Dunn explains that "[e]ach of these dilemmas, of course, involves the character in choices which require evaluation of the problem in light of chivalric values" (191). His ability to choose is only made more difficult by the ambiguity of Laureola's behavior. Several critics have sought to determine the truth of Laureola's feelings for Leriano, but I concur with Dunn in his

assessment that the ambiguity of her position is the result of a purposeful decision of San Pedro.[65] The dilemmas that the Autor faces draw us towards the novel's conflict, which Dunn describes as "irreconcilable and absolute," because "[f]or Leriano, passion is life, and refusal is death. For Laureola, her honor is life, and yielding to passion is death. The demands of love and of society are so opposed that 'life' and 'death' have reversible meanings" (193).

Dunn moves forward in the article with a discussion of how the Autor's many dilemmas in the text and his failures as he serves as go-between for his protagonists is reflective of the contradictory worlds which he attempts to reconcile.[66] I accept this argument wholeheartedly, until Dunn attributes the purpose of this representation to an attempt to give "access and a *point de repère* for the reader who is looking for a critique of all extremism" (196). Dunn gets back on track when he notes, "It is becoming clear that El Autor is not merely a messenger and go-between, but rather a character whose desired but impossible role is both mediation and integration in a world deeply segmented and irreconcilable" (196). In my opinion this entire line of reasoning has real potential, but I believe Dunn fails to draw it out fully. If San Pedro's point is to provide a critique of all extremism, then such a critique would apply to both Leriano's and Laureola's extremes. I simply do not believe that San Pedro's intent was to criticize the lovers. Instead, he could have used this same argument to show how the chivalric ideal that Leriano represents, which serves as one pole of the extremes and as a backdrop of discourse that is at its core literary, but also the basis on which the nobility had long founded its identity, is no longer viable in the world that he inhabits, because that world, while still paying lip service to the ideal, no longer plays by its rules. In my mind, the

Autor's inability to reconcile these worlds would have struck a chord with the readers for whom the novel was intended.[67] Instead Dunn ends with a discussion of the authorial process, how the presence of the figure of the Autor in the novel and his interactions with the various characters reveals that any given author is both "creator and creature of his forms and he is both enlarged and constrained by his powers," and that "San Pedro has discovered how to do an allegory of authorship" (198). While I do not disagree with these statements, I feel that they oversimplify the Autor's presence in Cárcel.

Alfonso Reyes studies the presence of the Autor in regards to the multiplicity of points-of-view that he represents in the novel (95-102). In some ways, Reyes echoes Dunn's comparison of the narrative points-of-view in Arnalte and in Cárcel, but he adds to the discussion a set of terms that describes their functions, an explanation of San Pedro's choices, and a defense of them as well. Reyes believes, like Dunn, that in Arnalte the narrator really serves as a transmitter of Arnalte's love adventure, but the story is actually a product of Arnalte's retelling of it (95). By contrast, the Autor in Cárcel, a full participant in the events, narrates in his own voice (96). Reyes attributes this change in narrative strategy from one work to the other to the structural needs of the plots and to the difference in San Pedro's intended attitude towards the novels' respective lovers.[68] San Pedro's structural needs in Cárcel include the fact that Leriano's death at the end requires an outside narrator to see the story to its conclusion,[69] and second, the fallibility of the Autor "es estructuralmente necesario, pues ahí se encuentra el desencadenante del conflicto ulterior" (97).

In addition, Reyes uses some helpful terminology to describe the multiple points of view of the Autor as being that of a "yo protagonista" (he also employs the term

"personaje testigo") at times and a "narrador omnisciente" at others (97). Depending on the role the Autor is fulfilling in that moment, the "personaje testigo," whose primary function in the text is to act as Leriano's messenger, sees the events through an optic "impregnada de la emoción, la parcialidad y las limitaciones de quien actúa como un personaje más. Su función primordial es la de enaltecer la figura de caballero enamorado, provocando en los lectores la conmiseración que experimentó su más directo colaborador" (Reyes 97-98). The corresponding vision of the omniscient narrador reflects an "ángulo visual" that is "más amplio que el de los personajes" (Reyes 98). According to Reyes, this second point-of-view serves to explain the interactions of certain characters to which the Autor would not otherwise be privy.

Reyes makes an effort to defend the multiplicity of narrative points-of-view in Cárcel, which are surprising to the modern reader not so much because of the diversity of perspectives they provide, but because they are "concentradas en una misma figura que habla en primera persona" (98). Up until this point I find Reyes' arguments to be worthy of serious consideration, but his attempt to defend the quality of San Pedro's writing causes him to render the following explanation:

> Esta especie de desdoblamiento de funciones repugna a los actuales criterios de verosimilitud. Pero desde esa óptica tampoco se podría aceptar, por ejemplo, que el autor comience su relato moviéndose en una realidad histórica y geográficamente documentable, se remonte abruptamente a una ficción alegórica y retorne finalmente a aquélla cuando, tras abandonar la cárcel de Leriano, llega 'aquí a Peñafiel'. Por lo demás no es Cárcel *de Amor* la única narración medieval que presenta una concepción tan multiforme de la primera persona. (98)

The problem with Reyes' analysis is that the differing points of view do not correspond in the novel to these movements between an allegorical world and a "real" one. I will reserve my thoughts on the undeniable multiplicity of narrative viewpoints as they relate to current metanarrative literary theory until a later point in this chapter.

James Mandrell makes a significant contribution to the discussion of the Autor's presence in Cárcel (99-122). His basic thesis responds to Reyes' previous assertions and suggests that the varied narrative perspectives that the character provides are not in any way improbable, because "one of the most salient features of the first-person voice that narrates events from the past is the tension between the narrator as speaking subject, narrating in the present, who knows the outcome of the story, and the character in the past tense, the fictional object as yet unaware of the events or resolution to come" (102). For Mandrell this "progression from disunity to unity" represents a transition in the authorial voice from one of "subservience to [one of] narrative authority" (103). The critic details the steps in this progression from uncertain participant as Leriano's messenger and as a reader of Laureola's signs (which would correspond to what Reyes terms the "personaje testigo") to an omniscient narrator. Mandrell notes that this change occurs at the point when Laureola and Leriano meet, which marks an important moment "in the development of the Autor's narrative authority" (110). Henceforth the narrator becomes "an active party to all communication," because "the range and number of characters has become too large for the Autor to remain a central and forefronted character" (112). This development, according to Mandrell, shows that "El Autor, by virtue of his status as omniscient narrator, demonstrates a more extensive authority, openly manipulating all details" (113). He continues to outline this progression claiming that the Autor "thwarts"

the desires of the king, Laureola and Leriano by means of his communication of Laureola's letters which Leriano had attempted to conceal by imbibing them (120).

Mandrell claims, then, that this gradual increase in authority of the narrator's voice functions as a warning to the "vuestra merced," to whom he directs himself at both the novel's beginning and end. Even the Autor's seeming deference to that authority figure ("llegué aquí a Peñafiel, donde quedo besando las manos de vuestra merced" (176)) is explained by Mandrell as a possible subversion of the hierarchal power it represents, when he states, "Even so, this hierarchy is no match for narrative authority that can subtly dismember the signs and symbols of a normative worldly authority to which the narration and even the narrator appear to remain subject" (121). The consequence of this subversion is "to exemplify the problematic nature of any claim to univocal authority and, ultimately, unequivocal meaning" (121). To be sure, the Autor's presence in the novel creates a sense of the difficulty involved in correctly reading signs in a hostile and unfamiliar world, which in turn inhibits the creation of what Mandrell terms the "unequivocal meaning," but I cannot accept his premise that this is achieved through the progressive growth in authority of the narrative voice, because the text does not support such a claim. The Autor appears to be uncertain and at times fallible, from beginning to end, due to the ambiguous circumstances he confronts and the emotional engagement he experiences as an interested party in the outcome of the events. As a result, he turns out to be a complete failure as a mediator and a politician. In my mind, this is one important aspect of this character that San Pedro intended in his creation, in order to make him experientially relevant to his audience.

María Angeles Belmar Marchante treats the topic of the supposed autobiographical nature that has been used in the past to characterize sentimental fiction in general (311-320). Her goal is to study the functionality of the voice of the textual "yo" in three sentimental romances: Siervo libre de Amor by Juan Rodríguez del Padrón and in both of San Pedro's: Cárcel and Arnalte. As she is attempting to explain the presence of this autobiographical "yo," she is really making an effort to expand on Wardropper's original assertions. I concur with her assessment that the sentimental novels are not autobiographical in a strict sense, but they "llevan impreso un intento de análisis de la realidad social del siglo XV" (312). Belmar Marchante continues: "Es necesario, por consiguiente, constatar que si bien el autor evita detallar pormenorizadamente su vida, al menos nos introduce, o eso intenta, en la intimidad que lo articula, aquello que le preocupa, o que le inquietó en algún momento de su existencia" (312). Even if this statement seems rather obvious, I think it is important to remember that any sincere author is going to produce works that are informed by his own experiences and belief system, without necessarily reproducing them autobiographically per se in his creation. In this sense, Belmar Marchante's approach to the sentimental novel is appropriate and quite in line with my own. She moves on to make another interesting characterization of Cárcel, when she states that San Pedro used typical literary resources of his time, heavily influenced by a classical style, in his choice of allegory, in order to "introducir a modo interpretativo una realidad concreta en la que se podría reconocer el momento de transición histórico-social que España vive" (318).

The article then makes a rather abrupt change in that it discusses the distinctive nature of the Autor character in Cárcel which is a result of his "configuración como

actor," which "parece haber sido impuesta desde fuera" (319). The dichotomy that she mentions in the title of the article resides in the fact that "Leriano resuelto en su categoría de personaje, induce al autor concretado como protagonista-narrador, a colaborar de modo directo en el relato" (319). As such, Belmar Marchante maintains that the presence of the Autor, imposed from outside the text, yet induced from within the text, constitutes its "novedad."[70] She attempts to tie this back into her original statements about the quasi-autobiographical nature of the novel by suggesting that the intimate participation of the Autor in the life of his character Leriano creates a shared emotional development as "psicológicamente ambos personajes han vivido emociones, si no idénticas, y dejándonos llevar por el relato ficticio, sí al menos análogas" (320). This leads to the idea that San Pedro "pondrá de relieve la inseparable experiencia que el autor tiene y que de manera ineludible manifiesta al desenvolverse en acto literario" (320). The final statement seems a bit anticlimactic in that it appears rather obvious. Unfortunately, Belmar Marchante fails to realize the possibilities of her arguments by presenting the technique of "dichotomy" as mere discursive device instead of explaining how this "tension" is relevant to the social and historical situation to which she alluded at the beginning of the article.

E. Michael Gerli is the only critic that I have found who analyzes the presence of the Autor in Cárcel as it relates to metafictional literary theory (57-63). Gerli finds that the representation of the "writer writing" is a commonality of Spanish sentimental romance, and it "elicits two basic literary questions—first, what is fiction? and second, how is text transformed through illusion to impart a sense of experience?" (57). Gerli accurately identifies at least some of the characteristics of metafictions in Cárcel, and he

even suggests that the result of the narrative technique is to transform the romance into "a serious instrument of critical inquiry," as the authors began "consciously to recognize the problematical relationship between reality and its representation in fictional discourse" ("Metafiction," 62). In Gerli's application of the theory to Cárcel in particular, he notes that "Cárcel is, then, a book that deals as much with the theme of imaginative literature itself as with the themes of love, honour, and sentimentality" ("Metafiction," 59).

Gerli more than effectively details the participation of the Autor as both creator and created, which I will likewise do later in this chapter; however, he makes a couple of points with which I would disagree. First, he maintains that one purpose of the self-referential status of Cárcel and other sentimental romances is to show "the author at work transforming lived experiences into literature." This sounds too much to me as if Gerli wants to return to the argument that sentimental fiction has autobiographical tendencies. If he intends to say that the metafictional nature of this group of fiction invites the reader to relate the literary experience with his own, then I am willing to accept this characterization. He then goes on to say that the structure is "[m]ore than a frame-story structure, this ingenious redoubling interplay of a text within a text typical of many Spanish sentimental romances asks us to alter our perceptions of written fiction and assent imaginatively to the idea that we are witnessing actual events, that what we perceive is outside illusion and nothing short of reality" ("Metafiction," 57). I cannot accept this idea, because I believe the purpose of the structure, at least in the case of Cárcel, is to emphasize the fictional nature that constructs the reality that these characters inhabit, with the result being that the reader would then transfer that notion to his own circumstances. Second, Gerli suggests that in sentimental fiction "the systematic

introduction of certain disruptive devices (portraying themselves as authors, presenting their characters as writers, or turning them and us quite consciously into readers)" serves to "intentionally violate our willingness to suspend disbelief and we see that for them, as for Cervantes a century and more later, the story told counts for less than the telling" ("Metafiction," 62). Once again, I have to disagree because in my analysis of Cárcel, I do not believe that one can judge the situation that makes up the "story" to be anything less than absolutely fundamental to the metaphor of the work as a whole. For me, that is the beauty of San Pedro's creation—the themes presented in the text are only enhanced by the metanarrative techniques that he employs. The criticism I have reviewed here regarding the Autor's role in the text comes up short, in my opinion, either because it only treats the technical aspects of how the Autor approaches the narration and other characters or because it treats his function from a purely theoretical perspective. I feel that there is still a need to explain how this particular narrative arrangement heightens the reader's understanding of the intended meaning of the text. My goal, then, is to discuss how exactly the structure of Cárcel supports the text's metaphor, and, to facilitate this exploration, I wlll analyze the novel in light of its metanarrative tendencies.

The term metafiction was introduced by the novelist and philosopher,William Gass, in his 1970 essay "Philosophy and the Form of Fiction," in which he states:

> There are metatheorems in mathematics and logic, ethics has its linguistic oversoul, everywhere lingos to converse about lingos are being contrived, and the case is no different in the novel. I don't mean merely those drearily predictable pieces about writers who are writing about what they are writing, but those, like some of the work of Borges, Barth, and Flann O'Brien, for example, in which the

forms of fiction serve as the material upon which further forms can be imposed. Indeed, many of the so-called antinovels are really metafictions. (24-25)

Since Gass postulated the idea, it has been the subject of many critics who have expanded and applied the concept, in an attempt to explain the novels of James Joyce, William Faulkner, John Fowles, Julio Cortázar, and José Luis Borges, to name just a few. In general, literary theorists and critics view metanarratives as an "unmasking" of dead literary conventions (Hutcheon 12), typically those of realism, which brings into question the nature of reality itself and fiction's relation to it.[71]

Let us look, then, at how literary theorists have identified both the essential tendencies of metafictions and the techniques authors employ to create "self-conscious" texts. Robert Alter defines the terms as a "novel that systematically flaunts its own condition of artifice and that by so doing probes into the problematic relationship between real-seeming artifice and reality" (x). This is achieved through an "effort to convey a sense of the fictional world as an authorial construct set up against a background of literary tradition and convention" (xi). Patricia Waugh further develops this definition by stating that metafictions' "lowest common denominator" is "simultaneously to create a fiction and to make a statement about the creation of that fiction" (6); and that it "sets mutually contradictory 'worlds' against each other," as "[a]uthors enter texts and characters appear to step into the 'real' worlds of their authors" (101). Steven Kellman makes an interesting observation about what he calls "the self-begetting novel," in which he compares its structure to that of a "double helix," in which "the project of the self-begetting novel is to create a structure within which its main character and fiction come to life" (6-7). In my opinion, Linda Hutcheon has most

thoroughly explored metafictional narratives in her work Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox, in which she emphasizes not only the "linguistic and narrative structures" of the texts itself but also the importance of the "role of the reader" (6). She further describes this second aspect by stating that "the reader has been asked to participate in the artistic process by bearing witness to the novel's self-analyzing development. The narrator-novelist has, from the start, unrealistically entered his own novel, drawing his reader into his fictional universe" (9). According to Hutcheon, "[T]he reader lives in a world which he is forced to acknowledge as fictional. However, paradoxically the text also demands that he participate, that he engage himself intellectually, imaginatively and affectively in its co-creation" (7). The text itself is a paradox in that while it is "narcissictically self-reflexive," it is also "focused outward, oriented toward the reader" (7). This duality draws us back to Kellman's double helix image in that if we consider the metanarrative text as a string of DNA, we have two separate strands, one being the inwardness of the text's self-awareness, and the other, its outward references to the lived experience of the reader and to the literary conventions it critically emulates. The strands cannot be separated from one another without damaging the effectiveness of the text's metaphor.

Finally, most of these critics I have quoted here allude to the relationship between metafictions and the cultures that produce them. Waugh claims both that "[m]etafictional writers [. . .]" turn "inwards to their own medium of expression in order to examine the relationship between fictional form and social reality" and that "[m]etafiction thus converts what it sees as the negative values of outworn literary conventions into the basis of a potentially constructive social criticism" (11). Alter emphasizes these works'

depictions of individuals' struggles to make sense of the fictional world they inhabit. He states: "The intuition of life that, beginning with Cervantes, crystallized in the novel is profoundly paradoxical: the novelist lucidly recognizes the ways man may be painfully frustrated and victimized in a world with no fixed values or ideals, without even a secure sense of what is real and what is not [. . .]" (18). Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg, [72] in their discussion of satire, make some relevant assertions to the present discussion. Admittedly, they are analyzing the social function of satire, but it does not seem a tremendous stretch to accept the existence of commonalities between them.[73] In their description of the satires of Augustan Rome and Augustan England, they note the contrast between "the ironical juxtaposition of a highly representational fictional world, against the suggestion of an ideal world whose values are daily denied in practice" (112). They further describe the world of satire as one that "depends on notions of the ideal proper to epic, romance and sacred myth, namely that the ideal world is good and the real world is bad; hence satire naturally flourished when the world is in transition from an ideally oriented moral scheme of the cosmos to an empirically oriented non-moral scheme" (112). In addition, Scholes and Kellogg note that satire "strikes out against a particular society for having fallen away from conformity to an ideal past and against the ideals of the past for having so little relevance to the real world" (112). And finally, these critics observe that there is a "paradoxical assumption implicit in all satire: a particular society is being ridiculed for having fallen away from a golden ideal, but the possibility exists that the ideal itself was only an absurdly inverted version of the true reality" (154). This characterization of satire rings true for metafictional narrative as both

depict the incongruity between the values of the fictional world the characters inhabit and the "real" world on the outside with a socially critical eye.

Before I move to a discussion of Cárcel as it relates to metafictional theory, it seems appropriate to summarize briefly the qualities of this literary technique. The most common features that these literary theorists attribute to metafiction, besides the obvious picture of the writer writing, are its systematic flaunting of its own condition of artifice, its use of dead literary conventions, and the manipulation and questioning of the boundary between fictional and real worlds, which involves the juxtaposition of mutually contradictory worlds. In addition, Hutcheon adds the importance of the role of the reader, and most of these critics consider the metafictional text to be a tool of social criticism and/or inquiry. I believe that Cárcel possesses all of these characteristics to a greater or lesser extent, but sufficiently to make us ask the questions: what critical function does this technique serve for San Pedro? and, have the majority of literary historians failed to give this work enough importance in terms of its influence on the development of the novel in Spain? But, first, let us look at the salient features of metafiction in Cárcel.

The novel's condition as artifice is probably the most fully developed of the metafictional characteristics. At the very outset of Cárcel, we have San Pedro's explanation of why he is writing:

> Verdad es que en la obra presente no tengo tanto cargo, pues me puse en ella más por necesidad de obedescer que con voluntad de escrevir. Porque de vuestra merced me fue dicho que devía hazer alguna obra del estilo de una oración que

enbié a la señora doña Marina Manuel, por[que le parescía menos] malo que el que puse en otro [tratado que vi]do mío. (80)

After the completion of this prologue, the subtitle "Comienza la obra" appears and then the action begins with the same voice serving as narrator. As stated previously, the novel ends with the Autor directing himself once again to the same "vuestra merced" to whom he says, "[c]on lágrimas partí; con gemidos hablé; y con tales pasatienpos llegué aquí a Peñafiel, donde quedo besando las manos de vuestra merced" (176). This structure creates a *mise en abyme* or a frame story; in this case, the "real" world serves as the outer frame for the fictional matter. The effects are various. First, the author's explanation of why he is writing makes the artificiality of the novel patently obvious, but it also immediately blurs the boundary between the real world of the "vuestra merced" and the fictional world of the Autor and the story he has to tell. In addition, the fact that San Pedro directs himself to his intended audience of readers on both ends of the novel creates an awareness of the presence of the reader.

The opening scene of Cárcel portrays the Autor, passing through the Sierra Morena, as he is returning home from the previous year's war. In his path he is confronted by a savage creature, which he describes as: "un cavallero assí feroz de presencia como espantoso de vista, cubierto todo de cabello a manera de salvaje" (81). This medieval yeti is forcibly dragging along another "cavallero," who upon seeing the Autor entreats him to assist him with these words: "Caminante, por Dios te pido que me sigas y me ayudes en tan grand cuita" (81-82). This scene, which always evokes an allusion to Luigi Pirandello's famous play, Sei personaggi in cerca di un' autore (1921) in my mind, is rich for metanarrative analysis. The narrator's mention of "la Guerra del

año pasado" (81) undoubtedly refers to the campaigns against Granada, which were taking place at the same time as the novel's composition. The reference to an event from the "real" world serves to juxtapose it with the fictitious one inhabited by such a fantastic creature as the hairy savage. Similarly, the manner in which the prisoner, whom we later clearly identify as the representative of the literary ideals of chivalry, addresses the Autor, inviting him into his fictive world, further blurs the line between the fictional and the real. As we will see later, he also serves as the conduit for the introduction of the backdrop of literary convention upon which the entire novel is constructed. Shortly after this opening scene, the reader realizes that the character of the narrative voice is referred to as "El Autor" throughout the course of the text. This constant use of this generic name makes the reader aware of the novel as literary artifice from beginning to end.

The Autor's reaction to Leriano's request for help is the first of many instances in the novel when he seems uncertain as to how to act or how to interpret the things going on around him. He says:

> Yo, que en aquella sazón tenía más causa para tem[e]r que razón para responder, puestos los ojos en la extraña vision, estove quedo, trastornando en el coraçón diversas consideraciones; dexar el camino que levava parecíame desvarío; no hazer el ruego de aquel que assí padecía figurávaseme inhumanidad; en siguille havía peligro y en dexalle flaqueza; con la turbación no sabía escoger lo mejor. Pero ya quel espanto dexó mi alteración en algund sosiego, vi cuánto era más obligado a la virtud que a la vida; y enpachado de mí mesmo por dubda en que estuve, seguí la vía de aquel que quiso ayudarse de mí. (82)

His doubts here are not just regarding what to do; he seems to have an ethical dilemma as well. Time and again the Autor expresses uncertainty as to how to proceed. For example, when Leriano asks him to go to Laureola to tell her of his imprisonment, the Autor responds:

> Mandasme, señor, que haga saber a Laureola cuál te vi, para lo cual hallo grandes inconvenientes, porque un hombre de nación estraña ¿qué forma se podrá dar para negociación semejante? Y no solamente hay esta dubda, pero otras muchas: la rudeza de mi engenio, la diferencia de la lengua, la grandeza de Laureola, la graveza del negocio; assí que en otra cosa no hallo aparejo sino en sola mi voluntad, la cual vence todos los inconvenientes dichos. (93)

In this instant, the Autor not only doubts whether he should go but also his personal capabilities to fulfill the task. Yet on another occasion, after Laureola has given him a farewell letter to deliver to Leriano, he is not sure what to do with it. He ponders to himself, "Muy dudoso estuve cuando recebí esta carta de Laureola, sobre enbialla a Lerano o esperar a levalla yo, en fin hallé por mejor seso no enbiárgela" (128). Still at other times the Autor appears inexperienced at reading his surroundings and his characters. As he is about to enter the allegorical prison of love, the guard says to him, "Amigo, bien paresce que de la usança desta casa sabes poco" (85), and then, later, Leriano feels the need to explain to him the meaning of the imagery of the prison because the Autor notes that Leriano "me vio atónito de ver cosas de tales misterios [. . .]" (88). The Autor also expresses his own unfamiliarity with the customs of Macedonia, saying "fui a palacio por ver el trato y estilo de la gente cortesana, y tanbién para mirar la forma

del aposentamiento, por saber donde me conplía ir o estar o aguardar para el negocio que quería aprender" (93).

As a character in the fiction that he himself is supposedly creating, he seems uncomfortable and unsure of himself. This sense is only exacerbated by his inability to accurately ascertain Laureola's feelings towards Leriano. He freely admits that his perceptions about her had been all wrong when he states:

> todas las vezes que tenía lugar le suplicase se doliese de Leriano, y todas las vezes que ge lo dezía, que fueron diversas, hallava áspero lo que respondía y sin aspereza lo que mostrava; y como traía aviso en todo lo que se esperava provecho, mirava en ella algunas cosas en que se conosce el coraçón enamorado: cuando estava sola veíala pensativa; cuando estava aconpañada, no muy alegre; érale la conpañía aborrecible y la soledad agradable. Más vezes se quexava que estava mal por huir los plazeres; cuando era vista, fengía algund dolor; cuando la dexavan, grandes suspiros; si Leriano se nombraba en su presencia, desatinava de lo que dezía, bolvíase súpito colorada y después amarilla, tornávase ronca su boz, secávasele la boca; por mucho que encubría sus mudanzas, forçavala la pasión piadosa a la disimulación discreta. Digo piadosa porque sin dubda, segund lo que después mostró, ella recebía estas alteraciones más de piedad que de amor. (98)

Similarly he expresses his frustration at being incapable of reading her, when he rants:

> Las cosas que con Laureola he pasado ni pude entenderlas ni sab[ré] decirlas, porque son de condición nueva; mill vezes pensé venir a darte remedio y otras tantas a darte la sepultura; todas las señales de voluntad vencida vi en sus aparencias; todos los desabrimientos de muger sin amor vi en sus palabras;

> juzgándola me alegrava, oyéndola me entristecía. A las vezes creía que lo hazía de sabida, y a las vezes de desamorada; pero con todo eso, viéndola movible, creía su desamor, porque cuando amor prende, haze el corazón constante, y cuando lo dexa libre, mudable. Por otra parte pensava si lo hazía de medrosa, segund el bravo corazón de su padre. (104)

This passage is of particular interest, because it also seems to place the blame on Laureola, to some extent, for making it so difficult on him. However, even if the Autor places blame on Laureola for his own confusion, he also admits that he participates in this game of sending out contradictory signs with his own behavior. In his description of his interaction with Laureola, the Autor states:

> [Y] hízele otra habla, mostrando miedo puesto que no lo tuviese, porque en tal negociación y con semejantes personas conviene fengir turbación, porque en tales partes el desenpacho es havido por desacatamiento, y parece que no se estima ni acata la grandeza y autoridad de quien oye con la desverguença de quien dize; y por salvarme deste yerro hablé con ella no segund desenpachado mas segud temoroso. (97)

Throughout the narrative the characters demonstrate the instablity of how signs are read in the society they inhabit. This instability is a product either of what is shown in the preceeding quotes, when the characters purposefully dissimulate so as not to give away their true feelings, or of the moral decay of the sign readers who as Laureola puts it "no [. . .] tan sanamente biven las gentes que, sabido que te hablé, juzgasen nuestras linpias intenciones, porque tenemos tienpo tan malo, que antes se afea la bondad que se alaba la virtud" (153). The depiction of this vicious cycle of having to act with cautious

insincerity because of the suspicious, jealous nature of the gossip-crazed society portrayed in Cárcel, is one effect produced by the Autor's uncertainty and failures. This is one example of social criticism that this self-conscious text provides.

One of the metanarrative techniques that can be seen in the Autor's uncertainty as he moves through the fictive world he is simultaneously creating is his mirroring of the authorial process, which continually emphasizes the artificial nature of the literary product he is constructing. However, his inability to "read" her also has an effect on the reader on the outside of the text. The ambiguity of Laureola as a text causes the reader to become, I believe, even more drawn into the narrative as a participant, trying to read her in the same way the Autor does.[74] As an interesting side note, we have an example of a reader who was so dissatisfied with San Pedro's decision to not resolve the mystery of Laureola's feelings that he felt compelled to write his own ending to the story. Thus, we have Nicolás Núñez's Continuación from 1496, in which he clarifies the matter to his own satisfaction—she indeed does love him. The existence of this text demonstrates San Pedro's success in drawing his reader in as a participant in his narration. This luring of the reader not only makes him or her emotionally invested in the outcome of the lovers, but it also serves as a catalyst to make the reader ask the same questions about the unstable nature of signs and, as we will now see, about the contradictory natures of the value systems represented in the novel through the use of literary convention.

By this point in this dissertation, it has hopefully become abundantly clear that Leriano represents the perfect courtly lover typical of medieval romance and chivalric literature. As a character, he embodies the qualities that San Pedro had recommended for the comportment of the male lover in his Sermón, the text to which he alludes in his

prologue. He functions, then, as the representative of that literary tradition, but in this case it is one that is not purely literary. The values of chivalry had long informed the world view and social values of the nobility. On the other hand, the rest of the characters inhabit a world that does not, in its actions, demonstrate that it shares the value system of our protagonist. That world serves "self," thwarts love at every turn, and bases honor not on virtue but on the opinions of others. While this world may seem conventional to readers of Spanish literature, specifically of the Golden Age drama, I do not believe it represents a literary convention in Cárcel, but rather a simulacrum of Spanish society at the time of the novel's creation.

San Pedro emphasizes the nature of these two contradictory worlds through the contrast between the two prisons of the novel: Leriano's allegorical prison of love and the real one that Laureola must endure because of her father's obsession with his honor. The two are set against each other throughout the plot in order to make this contrast clear. Leriano is only barely released from his "fictional" imprisonment by Laureola's act of compassion for him when she is thrust into the "real" one. And, not long after Leriano frees her from her incarceration, he returns to a prison of sorts, that of death. Or, we could say that Leriano chooses to die to free them both from the prisons that they have endured. The contrast between the natures of the two prisons is also key to drawing the reader from the fictive world of Leriano's prison to the real world of Laureola's. Leriano's dungeon is pure allegory—a highly representational place that requires an interpreter for the reader to understand all of the symbolism that it embodies. The dream-like nature of this place is purely literary and draws the reader into this construction of fantasy. The transference from Leriano's prison to Laureola's is effective in that it

creates a stark contrast between the literary and the real worlds, and at the same time, it challenges the reader to move between them as well.

The contrast of the ideal sphere of literary convention of Leriano with the realistic world of the other characters bares, at least situationally, some similarities with Don Quixote. However, Cervantes was clearly criticizing Spanish society for hiding behind the ideals of literary conventions in order to avoid facing reality. I think San Pedro portrays a much different attitude towards the idealism of Leriano. The Autor makes every effort to reconcile these contradictory worlds, but he fails. Because of his failure, love and honor's ideal dies; there is no alternative—they cannot exist as ideals in the real world and still be true to the values they represent. The Autor's reaction to Leriano's death is the key to understanding San Pedro's attitude towards the ideal:

> Lo que yo sentí y hize, ligero está de juzgar; los lloros que por él se hizieron son de tanta lástima que me parece crueldad escrivillos; sus honrras fueron conformes a su merecimiento, las cuales acabadas, acordé de partirme. Por cierto con mejor voluntad caminara para la otra vida que para esta tierra; con suspiros caminé; con lágrimas partí; con gemidos hablé [. . .]. (176)

He mourns the death of love and virtue's embodiment, and thus is critical of the "real" world which has perverted those ideals, emptying them of their beauty. The intended audience of Cárcel, as I have noted in a previous chapter, would have either belonged to the nobility or have shared in their world view. When speaking of their values, they would have likely paid lip-service to the same ideals that Leriano embodies in the text. However, one need only read the many fifteenth-century chronicles to see that both their actions and those of the monarchy were more in line with those of the other characters in

the novel. In Cárcel, San Pedro forces the reader to confront the contradictory nature of these two value systems. Poetic justice, which is a fundamental characteristic of the world of romance,[75] is clearly missing at the end of the novel. This striking absence would cause the well-read audience to come away from the text with a sense of uneasiness which would in turn encourage it to ponder the implications of the death of the ideal.[76] The readers, who have been drawn into this fictive world, enabling them to share in the Autor's experience, are pushed back into their own by the readdressing of the "vuestra merced" of the outer frame of the story in its very last line. This encourages them to draw from what they have just read a parallel to their own existence. Thus, as I have stated previously, San Pedro is able to fuse the text's metaphor with its structure. In my mind, this is the greatest achievement of Cárcel and marks it as a literary product well ahead of its time in terms of the development of the novel.

Almost without exception, the literary critics to whom I referred in my description of metafictional theory view Don Quixote as not just the first self-conscious piece of literature, but in many cases, the first novel.[77] Although some of them are willing to see the Spanish picaresque as a progenitor of the novel, very few, outside of select specialists,[78] value Cárcel for its importance in the development of the novel not just in Spanish but in European literature as well.[79] This chapter has shown that this novel possesses many of the characteristics of metafictional literature and thus, deserves a more serious consideration of its proper place in the history of the development of the novel in Western culture.

## Conclusion

In my mind, the fifteenth century is one of the most significant time periods in Spanish history in terms of the political and social development of the Spanish character. The brewing *converso* conflict, itself a result of anti-Jewish sentiments, produced the *limpieza de sangre* statutes and culminated in the establishment of the Inquisition. I believe the effect of the practices of this institution created an enduring scar of paranoia and obsessive preoccupation for the *¿qué dirán?* that added to that particularly Spanish concept of honor that had been developing for centuries, one that is not a measure of virtue but is constructed on the opinions of others based on appearances. In addition, the creation of the modern state through the marriage and political acumen of the Catholic Monarchs represented one of the most singularly fundamental events in Spanish history because of its many implications. Not only were they able to control the wily nobility, but they managed to redirect their energy towards the culmination of the Reconquest. The achievement of the capitulation of Granada, and all the battles leading up to it, solidified in the Spanish mentality their identity as a Catholic state with a mission and responsibility to serve God via military conquest. It is also this spirit that eventually spurred the Spanish imagination to consider the possibilities of exploration that led them to conquer new peoples and lands. The national pride that developed as Spain grew into a dominating world power would not have been possible without the first steps towards state formation that Isabel and Ferdinand's union precipitated. The chaos of the rule of Enrique IV stands in direct contrast to that of the Catholic Monarchs, not only because of the law and order that they reinstated but also in the way that each administration dealt with the nobility. As I have shown, the grandees ran roughshod over Enrique, constantly

manipulating him in order to further their own schemes, while Isabel and Ferdinand turned the tables on them, using them to advance the monarchy's agenda.

I reiterate these points because this moment in history that I believe to be so crucial was the environment in which Cárcel de Amor was written and in which it was read with such enthusiasm that it quickly became a best-seller of its time. At the beginning of this dissertation I posed the question: why was Cárcel so popular? Was it merely an escapist tale, as much courtly and chivalric literature, or was the work so widely read because it struck a chord of relevance for its Castilian, and later European, readership? I believe that I have shown that the latter is true because the novel intentionally bears out several of the issues facing the nobility at the time. First, as I have shown, San Pedro's contrast of the two types of honor embodied in the characters of Leriano, virtue's representative, and King Gaulo, who demonstrates an obsession with appearances, accurately portrays a developing phenomenon in Spanish culture at that time, one that would later be so commonly represented in the *pundonor* plays of Spanish Golden Age theatre. In addition, we could also see in the contrast between Leriano and Gaulo, one between acquired and inherited or ascribed honor. This is particularly apparent in the king's inexplicable preferential treatment of Persio and his family over Leriano. Although San Pedro never explicitly states this as a reason for such favoritism, he either could have felt the explanation was so obvious that it did not need to be said, or his silence on the issue could be interpreted as a calculated omission intended to create a greater impact by implying what its audience would have easily understood but could not be stated outright without creating problems for the author. Whatever Gaulo's reasons for favoring Persio over Leriano, his behavior represents a true cynicism of spirit. As

king, he should embody honor based on virtue, but instead, he demonstrates that he cares more about inherited honor constructed on appearances and completely devoid of virtue.

Another issue that would have struck a chord with Cárcel's readership would have been the apparent incompatibility between love and Leriano's version of honor. Laureola's dilemma, as she must choose between the two, really represents a societal one and likewise presents itself as a moral question that San Pedro's readers would have pondered. Her decision to side with her father's vision of honor in order to protect herself proved to be a deathwish for love's representative, Leriano. It also serves as a prediction of where the society she embodies was heading. Fortunately, we have an example of how unsettling this tragic ending was for San Pedro's readership in the continuation of the tale that Nicolás Núnez felt compelled to write. In his alternate ending, Laureola faces Leriano and confesses her true feelings of love for him, an admission that supports the vision of Laureola as yet another victim of her father's obsession because she had to turn her back on Leriano despite her love for him.

The political material in Cárcel presents two additional issues that would have spoken to its readers' personal experiences: one is a question of identity and the other a crisis of conscience. Members of the nobility could have seen the crumbling of the chivalric ideals that had so long defined them as the King's and Persio's behavior revealed that the virtue that chivalry represented was no longer functional due to the transformation of those ideals into empty shadows of what they originally meant. Leriano, who perfectly embodies the beauty of chivalry at its best, has no chance to succeed because the society in which he lives has ceased to honor those ideals beyond the emptiness of paying them lip service. Even so, San Pedro paints Leriano, and all of the

idealism he portrays, as heroic to the end; he never questions the value or beauty of the chivalric ideal. Other readers of any social standing could have also recognized in the King's treatment of both his loyal vassal Leriano, and even worse, his betrayal of his own daughter, the monarchy's willingness to sacrifice the innocent for its own political needs. Of course, this situation would have had particular meaning given that the Inquisition was in full force and gaining momentum simultaneously as San Pedro was writing.

The structure of the novel, including San Pedro's use of metanarrative strategies, supports his theme, and I would say, makes it even more effective. By inviting the reader into the narrative process, San Pedro creates the illusion that the reader is a part of the society that the novel inhabits. Through the blending of the fictional and the "real" worlds, he suggests the fictive nature of the reality that society creates in terms of its view of honor, and, in the political realm, of the identity of the nobility and the very unchristian nature of the policies of the Catholic Monarchs that led to the creation of the Inquisition. He accomplishes this luring of the reader into the text in a variety of manners. First, at the the beginning and end of the novel, the Autor character addresses a particular reader, the Vuestra Merced to whom the work is dedicated, which creates a *mise en abyme*, or frame story, but also mixes his fictional character with a historical entity who exists outside of the text. In addition, San Pedro constantly makes the reader aware of the reading and writing process in several ways. The simple inclusion of a character called the Autor serves as a constant reminder to the audience of the literary journey he is on. As well, the continual writing and reading of letters emphasizes both the creation and reception of meaning, and in the case of the latter, proves to be somewhat tricky. Both Leriano's and the Autor's uncertainties and failures at correctly

reading the signs of those around them demonstrate just how tricky this process is in a society that bases its judgment of one's value on outward appearances instead of truth. At the same time, San Pedro's choice to be purposefully ambiguous about some of these "readings" of signs around them, particularly the true nature of Laueola's feelings and the reasons for Gaulo's unjust treatment of Leriano, force the reader to try to answer for himself not only these questions but the larger ones that he poses in the text.

Because of the way in which Cárcel documents the social and political concerns of the crucial historical moment in which it was written, I believe that this novel merits much greater attention than it has generally received in Spanish literary history. This is even more certain if one considers the important role it plays, as I have shown, in the development of the *pundonor* theme, but also in the advancement of fictional discourse and the steps it marks towards the modern novel.

Notes

[1] For detailed numbers on best-sellers in the Spanish Golden Age, see Keith Whinnom's article "The Problem of the 'Best-seller' in Spanish Golden-Age Literature," BHS 58 (1980): 189-198, in which he states:

> Leaving that on one side, probably the most impressive fact about the sixteenth century is that, despite the legion of new writers, the book-production of that period is dominated by fifteenth-century writers. Celestina--without counting its sequels and imitations--leads the way, but Mena's Laberinto, the anonymous fifteenth-century verse translation of Aesop, Jorge Manrique's Coplas por la muerte de su padre, Fray Juan de Padilla's Retablo de la vida de Cristo (of which there is no complete modern edition), Diego de San Pedro's Pasion trobada, his Cárcel de Amor, Montalvo's Amadís, all achieved best-selling success, and among Mena Rojas, Montalvo, San Pedro and company, only six sixteenth-century authors make any showing at all. Whichever sets of figures one uses, Celestina was quite clearly the most successful piece of fiction in the entire Golden Age, eclipsed only if we allow Amadis to embrace its sequels. Second and third in the fiction class come Guzmán de Alfarache and Montemayor's Diana. Tailing behind these, equal fourth with Amadís and Cárcel de Amor, comes Don Quixote (193).

Regarding the numerous translations of the Cárcel, Michele Ripa writes: "La Cárcel de amor di Diego de San Pedro - la piú nota fra le *novelas sentimentales* - ebbe grande successo non soltanto in Spagna, ma anche in Europa, come testimoniano soprattutto le

versioni cinquecentesche italiana, francese e inglese, e le loro numerose ristampe" ("Ancora sulla fortuna inglese della Cárcel de Amor," Il confronto letterario 27 (1997): 3).

[2] Whinnom provides a complete list of all known early and modern versions of Cárcel in the "Noticia bibliográfica" of his edition of the novel (Diego de San Pedro, Obras completas, II: Cárcel de Amor.

[3] Keith Whinnom, Diego de San Pedro (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1974) 17. Whinnom refers to Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo's error which is located in his Orígenes de la novela, II (Santander: C.S.I.C., 1962) 31-32 and to Nicolás Antonio's in his Bibliotheca hispana vetus, II (Rome: Antonio de Rubeis, 1696) No. 326.

[4] Whinnom identifies these documents as 1.) one dated 1459 (from the Archives of the House of Osuna) which granted a Diego de San Pedro the power to take possession of certain villages in the area surrounding Peñafiel on behalf of Don Pedro Girón; 2.) the will of Don Pedro, which dates from 1466 (Archivo de la Casa de Osuña, bolsa 19, no.1); 3.) the Libro de las ordenanzas of the guild of hidalgos of Peñafiel which contains a list of 170 names of current and past members of the brotherhood copied into a document (Santiago 3120 of the Archivo Histórico Nacional, folios 15v-31r) of the Order of Santiago in 1592; and 4.) a final document concerning a case of pasture rights in 1472 in which Diego de San Pedro, chief magistrate over the matter, ruled. Whinnom explains that he has not been able to personally locate the last document, but is sure it still exists as it is quoted by F. Fernández de Bethencourt in his Historia genealógica y heráldica de la monarquía española, 10 vols. (Madrid 1897-1900), II 523-33 'Casa de Urueña.'

[5] The Desprecio de la Fortun*a* in which he mentions the 29 years of service to the Count of Urueña is the last of San Pedro's known works. In the first two stanzas of the poem, he alludes to the vanity of his two sentimental novels Cárcel and Tractado de amores de Arnalte y Lucenda. This is pertinent to the question of San Pedro's identity because in each of these works, he leaves clues in his references to historical figures. For example, the Tractado includes a lengthy panegyric enumerating the positive qualities of Queen Isabella, and in Cárcel's introduction San Pedro explains that he writes at the request of Diego Fernández de Córdoba, the seventh Alcaide de los Donceles, who wanted him to compose a novel fashioned on the lovers' advice of his Sermón, which he had dedicated to Doña Marina Manuel. The former gained fame as a young man during the 1480s for his success in various battles of the Reconquest. The latter was a member of Castile's very highest nobility and served as an attendant to Isabella until at least 1490. Both of these figures were related by marriage to the Téllez-Girón family.

[6] According to Whinnom, Don Juan and his brothers were legitimized by Papal Bull and royal decree (San Pedro 23).

[7] Don Pedro died en route to marry the then Infanta Isabel, who, as legend has it, prayed fervently for God's intervention so that she would not have not have to comply with the marriage arranged by her brother. Diego de Valera attributed the death of such a powerful baron to the prayers of Isabella in his Memorial de diversas hazañas, BAE 70 (1953): 39.

[8] Whinnom notes that neither Don Juan nor his twin brother Rodrigo, who had inherited the Mastership of Calatrava, actually assumed the responsibilities of these titles

until they turned 16 in 1472. Their guardians, Enrique de Figueredo and Juan Pacheco, managed their concerns for them until they came of age (San Pedro 23-24).

[9] "Después de hecha la Guerra del año pasado, viniendo a tener el invierno a mi pobre reposo, pasando una mañana, cuando ya el sol quería esclarecer la tierra, por unos valles hondos y escuros que se hazen en la Sierra Morena, [. . .]" (81).

[10] In 1502 Don Juan led a campaign against the Moors of the Sierra Bermeja who were rebelling against the monarchy (Whinnom, San Pedro 27).

[11] Alter Isabel's death in 1505, Don Juan became involved in a plot against Ferdinand who was serving as Regent of Castile (Whinnom, San Pedro 27).

[12] Whinnom indicates that the poem displays some characteristics that would later be associated with topics typical of the Reformation such as:

> a renewed interest in the Bible, and most especially the New Testament, with a consequent discarding of apocryphal material and a turning away from much medieval miracle-literature; a shift of emphasis from the person of the Virgin Mother to the person of Christ; an impatience with scholastic theology and an enthusiasm for simple piety; and an insistence on the spiritual life of the individual, on the importance of prayer, and on the *imitatioChristi*, the idea that the life of Christ is the perfect model for that of the sincere Christian—a concealed corollary of which is the heretical and rarely-expressed notion that priests and the rites of the Church are not essential to a man's salvation (San Pedro 37-38).

[13] During the course of Arnalte, the lover's lack of decorum is evident in the following examples: when he crossdresses in order to approach Lucenda, when he has his servant go through the garbage heap outside of her home to search for a letter, and when he becomes completely surprised upon her rejection of his offer of marriage after he has killed her husband.

[14] Whinnom notes that

> [t]he history of the literary genre to which we must assign Diego de San Pedro's poem on The Seven Sorrows (or Dolores) of Our Lady begins in the twelfth century, in medieval Latin, and makes its earliest appearance in Spanish in the thirteenth century, in the first of the *cantigas*, or songs, which Alfonso X (1252-1284) dedicated to the Virgin, celebrating her *VII goyos* (her 'Seven Joys'). [. . .] There are lyric poems on the Joys of the Virgin composed by the Archpriest of Hita, by an anonymous poet in the Cancionero de Baena, by Fernán Pérez de Gúzman, by the Marquis of Santillana, and various others." Whinnom points out that poems describing the corresponding Sorrows appeared sometime later, with the earliest example in Spanish belonging again to King Alfonso X. (San Pedro 55)

[15] One reason that Whinnom believes the poem was written previously and then inserted into the novel is that it seems displaced because it only vaguely relates to the subject matter of Arnalte's sorrows. He finds that the serious nature of the Virgin's sorrows makes the lover's own amorous preoccupations seem trivial (San Pedro 60). It is possible, in my opinion, that the contrast between the selfless love of a mother and the

selfish nature of Arnalte's pursuit of Lucenda brings about the desired effect of underscoring his faults as a lover.

[16] Whinnom points out this commentary in Gracián's analysis of "El mayor bien de quereros" which can be found in Baltasar Gracián, Agudeza y arte de ingenio, ed. Evaristo Calderón, 2 vols. (Madrid: Castalia, 1969) in *Discurso* XXIV, I, 236-246.

[17] George Northrup, Introduction to Spanish Literature. (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1936) 157.

[18] Bruce Wardropper, "Allegory and the Role of *El Autor* in the Cárcel de Amor," Philological Quarterly 31 (1984): 42-43. Dorothy Severin echoes a similar opinion in her article "Structure and Thematic Repetitions in Diego de San Pedro's Cárcel de Amor and Arnalte y Lucenda," HR 45 (1977): 165-169.

[19] This is where Chorpenning seems to have changed his view. In "Loss of Innocence, Descent into Hell, and Cannibalism: Romance Archetypes and Narrative Unity in Cárcel de Amor," MLR 87 (1992): 342-351, he states: "Laureola, in the form of her shredded letters, is metaphorically torn apart and served up for a cannibal feast which parodies the Eucharist. The archetypes of human sacrifice and cannibalism leave no doubt as to the diabolical nature of the kingdom of the god of Love of which Leriano is a subject and, consequently, of the passion with which he is infected" (350). For other negative views on these images see Ian Michael, "Spanish Literature and Learning to 1474," in Spain: A Companion to Spanish Studies, ed. by P.E. Russell (London, Methuen, 1973): 237, and Kurtz "The Castle Motif," 39.

[20] Gerli, "Leriano's Libation" 415. Gerli provides specific examples of *cancionero* poems, which he believes directly influenced San Pedro in Cárcel.

[21] This article can be found in The Age of the Catholic Monarchs, 1474-1516: Literary Studies in Honor of Keith Whinnom, ed. by Alan Deyermond and Ian Macpherson, *BHS* Special Issue, (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1989): 144-154. However, the original discovery of the connection between the two works was first made by José F. Gatti in Contribuición al estudio de la *Cárcel de Amor*: la apologia de Leriano, (Buenos Aires, 1955).

[22] Whinnom, San Pedro 113-114. For a further explanation of the differences in rhetorical style between the two works see Whinnom's article "Diego de San Pedro's Stylistic Reform," BHS 37 (1960): 1-15.

[23] All four of the novels she discusses are products of the last three decades of the fifteenth century according to Waley, "Love and Honour" 253.

[24] Sol Miguel Prendes, "Las cartas de la Cárcel de Amor," Hispanofila 34.3 (1991): 1-22. In this article, Miguel-Prendes follows Chorpenning's basic argument, but shows how the rhetorical structure of the letters themselves serve as the mode for the organization of the novel.

[25] Joseph A. Chorpenning, "Loss of Innocence, Descent into Hell, and Cannibalism: Romance Archetypes and Narrative Unity in Cárcel de Amor," MLN 87 1992): 342-343. Frye's texts alluded to by Chorpenning include The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard UP, 1976);

Anatomy of Criticism Four Essay*s* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1957); and The Great Code: The Bible and Literature (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981).

[26] This article can be found in several sources, but the one I have referenced is The Approach to the Spanish Drama of the Golden Age, (London: The Hispanic & Luso-Brazilian Councils, 1957) 4-6. While this is a stand-alone version, it is also included with modifications in The Great Playwrights, Vol. 1, ed. Eric Bentley, (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1970) 679-707.

[27] Aristotle, Poetics, trans. Stephen Halliwell (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995) 69. In his article "What is the Spanish Comedia?" found in the anthology The Great Playwrights, cited above, Parker notes that this emphasis on plot over character is "likely to offend modern readers," who prefer well-developed characters to a complex set of actions (682).

[28] Among the critics who hold such opinions of the protragonists in Cárcel are: Angel Valbuena Prat in Historia de la literatura española, Tomo 1. (Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, 1956); James A. Flightner in "The Popularity of the Cárcel de Amor," Hispania 47.3 (1964); and Elizabeth Theresa Howe in "A Woman Ensnared: Laureola as Victim in the Cárcel de Amor," REH 21 (1987).

[29] For example, Whinnom suggests that the purpose of the Author character is to be able to narrate the tale to its conclusion, given that Leriano's suicide would otherwise make this impossible (San Pedro, 106). Alfonso Reyes in his article "La primera persona narrativa en Diego de San Pedro," BHS 58 (1981) 96, explains the character as being

essential to the maintenance of Leriano's status as the perfect courtly lover, given that he would not be able to relate these events without breaking the rules regarding secrecy.

[30] Benzion Netanyahu, The Origins of the Inquisition in Fifteenth Century Spain, (New York: New York Review Books, 2001) 94. Although this text seeks to explain the causes of the Inquisition, it is extremely detailed in its descriptions of every facet of the political and social climate of Castile and Aragon in the fifteenth century.

[31] Netanyahu 114-115. Here Netanyahu is quoting documents from the Cortes of Burgos from 1367 which are found in §10 Cortes de León y de Castilla, II (Madrid: Academia de la Historia) 150-151.

[32] Netanyahu 118. Citing documents from the Cortes of Toro, 1371, §2 (CLC, II .203).

[33] Netanyahu 118-119. Citing documents from the Cortes of Toro, 1371, §2 (CLC, II .203).

[34] Another wave of mass conversions was brought about by the "Laws of Catalina" of 1412 which essentially sought to socially and economically strangle the remaining Jewish communities of Castile, forbidding them to interact with Christians in almost every aspect. Netanyahu states that "According to Zacuto, the fifteenth-century Jewish chronicler, it was the 'largest forced conversion that had ever taken place in Jewish history.' And this was written by a man who was well aware of the scope of the disaster of 1391" (196).

[35] Palencia reported that:

D. Juan Pacheco, trabajando por acrecentar el favor de que gozaba, se cuidó muy poco de la seguridad de D. Alvaro, y sólo atendió a que los asuntos de ambos partidos quedasen en tal estado, que forzosamente hubiesen de recurrir a él como a intermediario y arbitro entre todos. Para ellos, aconsejaba a D. Enrique que no se entregase en manos de su padre, ni combatiese al partido de su madre, sino que, inclinándose algún tanto al de sus tíos, procurase moderar el afecto del Rey hacia D. Alvaro (11).

[36] Netanyahu 251. This referenced address is on p. 327 of the Crónica del halconero de Juan II by Pero Carrillo de Huete, ed. Carriazo, 1946.

[37] Netanyahu 324. This information comes from the Abreviación del Halconero, ms. 324, 525-526.

[38] Netanyahu 336. Here he has translated the Bull from Spanish which can be found in an appendix to Alonso de Cartagena's Defensorium Unitatis Christianae, ed. Manuel Alonso, Publicaciones de la Escuela de Estudios Hebraicos Serie B, Número 2 (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1943) 367-370.

[39] Netahyahu, 720-721. Here the author has translated into English from Hernando de Castillo's Primera Parte de la Historia General de Santo Domingo y de su Orden, ch, 2, p.101b-102a, 1587.

[40] It is interesting to note that Pulgar comments on this change in Enrique's situation and explains it as Enrique's punishment because

se deve creer que Dios, quiriendo punir en esta vida alguna desobediencia que este rey mostró al rey su padre, dio logar que fuese desobedecido de los suyos y

permitió que algunos criados de los más aceptaos que este rey tenía, [. . .]. Y no podiendo refrenar la enbidia concebida de otros que pensavan ocuparles el logar que tenían , conocidas en este rey algunas flaquezas nacidas del ábito que tenía fecho en los deleites, osaron desobedecerle y poner disensión en su casa. (87)

[41] Netanyahu, 768-787. The historian outlines the details of the second Toledan outbreak citing Palencia's version of the event.

[42] Netanyahu 786. This is Netanyahu's translation from Palencia's Crónica de Enrique IV, 115.

[43] Examples of these works include the Poema del mío Cid, various of the *cantares de gesta*, including La leyenda de Don Rodrigo and the Cantar del Conde Garci Fernández y la Condesa traidora, *las cantigas d'amigo* y *las jarchas*, Libro de Apolonio, the Cantar de Fernán González, Libro de buen amor, Cancionero de Baena, Romancero viejo, Corbacho by Arcipreste de Talavera, Eglogas by Juan del Encina, various sentimental novels such as Juan Rodríguez del Padrón's Siervo libre de Amor, Juan de Flores' Historia de Grises y Mirabella and Don Pedro de Portugal's Cuestión de Amor and his Sátira de felice e infelice vida.

[44] Juan de Flores used the "Law of Scotland" in his novel *Historia de Grisel y Mirabella* in which her father, the King of Scotland, catches the title characters in a compromising situation. He determines that according to the law of the land the one who seduced the other should die, so he arranges a trial to determine which one is at fault. Because of their mutual faithfulness, both Grisel and Mirabella determine to take the blame for the seduction in order to save the other. She is found to be the guilty party, but

before the sentence can be imposed upon her, Grisel throws himself onto the pyre. There do exist other examples of the literary usage of the Law, but this one is the most approximate to *Cárcel* in that they were written roughly during the same time period.

[45] Among these moralists we include Alonso de Cartagena (Defense of Christian Unity), Fernando del Pulgar (especially in his letters), Alonso de Palencia (see his memoires Three Decades of my Life) and Diego de Valera (Mirror of True Nobility). Most of these works were meant to defend New Christian's right to honor and nobility.

[46] In 1449, Fernán Díaz de Toledo wrote his "Instruction" for the Bishop of Cuenca, Lope de Barrientos, regarding the proposed statute, in which he traces the Jewish blood in all of the leading noble families of Castile, even the Henríquez family from which Fernando el Católico came. His objective for doing so was primarily to demonstrate how ridiculous it would be to enact the *limpieza de sangre* statute when Jewish blood was present in all of the most important blood lines of Castile. See Henry Kamen's The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision (London: Yale UP, 1997) 32, for a detailed discussion of the contents of the "Instruction."

[47] The most often quoted passage from the Bible that treats the topic of love is found in I Corinthians 13:1-8:

> If I speak in the tongues of men and angels, but have not love, I am only a resounding gong or a clanging cymbal. If I have the gift of prophecy and can fathom all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have a faith that can move mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. If I give all I possess to the poor and surrender my body to the flames, but have not love, I gain nothing. Love is

patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. It is not rude or self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs. Love does not delight in evil but rejoices in truth. It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres. Love never fails. *The NIV Study Bible*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan:Zondervan Bible Publishers, 1985) 1752.

[48] Specifically Elizabeth Teresa Howe in her article "A Woman Ensnared: Laureola as Victim in the Cárcel de amor," Revista de Estudios Hispánicos, XXI:1 (Enero 1987), 13-27, asserts that Leriano makes 'ill-considered demands" (13) because of "the self-absorbing nature"(15) of his love for Laureola. She doubts the motives of Leriano's defense of Laureola's life by explaining that he must do so "[s]ince her death would confirm Persio's slander and Leriano's dishonor, it is incumbent on him that she live if his honor is to be restored" (21). Howe finds fault with Leriano's deathbed defense of women because she claims that "the bula of Leriano's reasons for honoring woman rests less on her intrinsic worth than it does on how she serves man" (23).

[49] Keith Whinnom, introduction, Obras completas, I: Tractado de amores de Arnalte y Lucenda y el Sermón , by Diego de San Pedro (Madrid: Clásicos Castalia, 1973) 67. Whinnom is making the contrast here between this type of guide for the "honest lover' and the more Ovidian style of *ars amatoria* which guided the lover toward a successful conquest.

[50] These works include: Vidriana (1550, Tidea (1550) by Francisco de las Natas, Tholomea (1566) by Alonso de la Vega, El infamador (1579) Juan de la Cueva.

[51] Stanislav Zimic in his book El pensamiento humanístico y satírico de Torres Naharro (Santander: Sociedad Menéndez Pelayo, 1978) points out that the Himenea represents:

> una categórica contradicción a la opinión de que el teatro no podía ser vehículo adecuado para la censura de los aspectos más abominables del concepto del honor. En efecto, su pensamiento se inspira en las fuentes religiosas y filosóficas más pristinas: San Pablo, Séneca, el neoplatonismo, Erasmo… En esta tradición encuentra una convincente confirmación de que el único honor verdadero es sinónimo de la virtud, de la bondad, de la conciencia limpia, del amor al prójimo (191).

It seems that this theme so beautifully expressed in Torres Naharro is very similar to San Pedro's message in Cárcel, and therefore makes it clear that the work is much more serious in terms of its social implications than many critics have judged.

[52] Both Castro and Menéndez Pidal discuss the origins of the concept of honor portrayed in Golden Age theatre.

[53] Maureen Ihrie, "Discourses of Power in Cárcel de Amor," Hispanofila 125 (Jan 1999): 1. In this article, she interprets the entire novel as a rhetorical game.

[54] As stated in my introduction, I use a thematic structural approach drawn from Alexander A. Parker's Approach to the Spanish Drama of the Golden Age, (London: The Hispanic & Luso-Brazilian Councils) 1957.

[55]San Pedro draws attention to the high quality of Laureola's character with such statements as "¿por qué pusiste la lengua en Laureola, que sola su bondad bastava, si toda

la del mundo se perdiese, para tornarla a cobrar?" (115) and "todos los que de ti (Laureola) tenían noticia havía por pequeña cosa este reino que haviés de heredar, segund lo que merecías; . . . y dizen los que te conocen que no cupiera en toda la tierra tu merecer. Los ciegos deseavan vista por verte, y los mudos habla por alabarte y los pobres riqueza por servirte." (135)

[56] The Bible could not be clearer regarding the matter: Romans 12:19 "Do not take revenge, my friends, but leave room for God's wrath, for it is written: 'It is mine to avenge; I will repay,' says the Lord." Matthew 18:21-22: "Then Peter came to Jesus and asked, 'Lord, how many times shall I forgive my brother when he sins against me? Up to seven times?' Jesus answered, 'I tell you, not seven times, but seventy-seven times.'" Mark 11:25: "And when you stand praying, if you hold anything against anyone, forgive him, so that your Father in heaven may forgive you your sins." All taken from the New International Version.

[57] Otis H. Green discusses honor/vengeance with the Christian ethic as a topic amongst 16th century moralists in his Spain and the Western Tradition, vol. 1, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963) 16-21.

[58] Whinnom analyzes in detail San Pedro's origins in Diego de San Pedro, (New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1974) 17-22.

[59] San Pedro sets the novel first in Spain and then, as if in a dream sequence, the action transfers to a kingdom in Macedonia, which Whinnom describes as "such a vague and unreal country (to which, it seems, one travels much like Alice to Wonderland) that this serves to departicularize him (Leriano) rather than particularize him" (108). We

could say the same for the author's setting, which would be a choice made to protect himself from any political fallout.

[60] Whinnom notes that San Pedro was encouraged to continue in his literary endeavors by "the ladies of the court, by Doña Marina Manuel, by the Alcaide de los Donceles 'and other gentleman of the court,' and not least by his own master and patron, Don Juan Téllez-Girón" (33-34).

[61] Whinnom tells us that the "donceles" were "a troop of light cavalry composed solely of young nobleman who enjoyed certain privileges." This young man, who would have led this troop, won fame for his prowess and exploits on the battlefield, specifically at Lucena, and for his capture of King Boabdil of Granada. Later he would continue to rise in fame and power, and he was connected to the Téllez-Girón familiy through marriage (25-26). While I do not suggest that San Pedro modeled Leriano on don Diego, it would not be a reach to suggest that the young courtier and warrior would have easily related to the protagonist.

[62] Whinnom notes that at least 15 *cancionero* ballads attest to his heroism (24).

[63] Stanza 24 reads:

> Y aquestas riquezas, llenas
> de fatiga y pesar,
> pues sin galardón dan penas,
> no sé para qué son buenas
> sino para sólo dar.
> Pero como son amadas,

prenden a todo varón

si no sabe sus entradas;

y assí pueden ser llamadas

cadenas del corazón.

While stanza 36 reflects on the effects of ambition:

Según se sabe y se obra,

pocas vezes vienen males

donde escándalo se cobra,

sino haviendo mucha sobra

d'estos bienes temporales.

D'allí la cobdicia prende,

por allí la enbidia anda,

d'allí lujuria se enciende,

d'allí vanagloria offende,

de allí la sobervia manda.

San Pedro, Obras completas , *III* 288, 295.

[64] Wardropper points to this claim made by Menéndez Pelayo in his "Introducción" to the Orígenes de la novela in NBAE, I cccxx.

[65] Dunn states: "I am not concerned to answer the questions about what is happening in the inner world of Laureola's feelings, but only to note that the text permits us to ask them. In fact, I am not convinced that we should try to answer such questions. The author seems to me to have been less concerned that we discover what was in

Laureola's mind than that we see and appreciate how uncertain are the physical signs which accompany the emotions" (194-195).

[66] Dunn notes that the Autor "moves between a man who accepts the tyranny of love and a lady who will be destroyed if she does not respect the tyranny of honor. Leriano and Laureola inhabit their contradictory worlds, the one captivated by, but still accepting, a passion which demands perfection in the service of a singular person, the other constrained by a discipline which submits the individual to the sanctions of the tribe. When we reach this point we can see how the narrator by his very disinterestedness and desire to bring happiness will run the risk that every mediator does. His reasonableness and sensibility will not only make him unable to comprehend the total separateness of the two positions, but in this case the act of conciliation can do nothing but excite the destructive violence which is implicit in their separation. By means of this narrator, and his lapses, San Pedro has been able to show the mutually irreconcilable worlds of passionate love and of honor in their extreme forms" (196).

[67] The outermost narrative frame of the novel makes the intended readership of the novel abundantly clear: "El siguiente tractado fue hecho a pedimiento del señor don Diego Hernandes, Alcaide de los Donzeles, y de otros cavalleros cortesanos," (79) and then proceeds to write in his introduction that he is writing at the behest of "vuestra merced" who had requested that he write something in the "estilo de una oración que enbié a la señora doña Marina Manuel" (80). The novel ends with the narrator's return to Peñafiel, and thus to the aforementioned narrative frame where he remains "besando las manos de vuestra merced" (176).

[68] Reyes notes, "[N]o deja de ser significativo el contraste entre la imparcialidad con que el autor presenta a Arnalte y la simpatía con que habla de Leriano," which he believes is a product of the "distinto uso de la primera persona" (99).

[69] Reyes points out that "[h]ay una razón obvia que explica el nuevo ángulo adoptado: la historia de Leriano no es evocada por el protagonista, sino vivida en el presente, y puesto que muere, otra persona tiene que contarla" (96).

[70] The critic maintains that "[e]ste artificio literario, podría ser determinante a la hora de considerar la Cárcel de Amor como una de las obras principales de la novela sentimental; lo que pretendo sugerir es que frente a los caracteres obvios, en lo que se refiere al estilo de la obra y apuntados en varias ocasiones por la crítica, podemos hablar de novedad si aludimos a la específica manera de distinguirse Diego de San Pedro en la obra" (319).

[71] In Patricia Waugh's Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-conscious Fiction (New York: Metheun, 1984) she describes metafictional texts as "providing a critique of their own methods of construction, such writings not only examine the fundamental structures of narrative fiction, they also explore the possible fictionality of the world outside the literary fictional text" (2).

[72] Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg, The Nature of Narrative. (New York: Oxford UP, 1966)

[73] Margaret A. Rose in her study Parody//Meta-Fiction: An Analysis of Parody as a Critical Mirror to the Writing and Reception of Fiction (London: Croom Helm, 1979) makes the following statement in her Introduction: "As a form of meta-fiction, parody

has often been used as a basis for general literary theory, and to study such parody is to study the analysis of fiction made from within fiction itself" (13). The satirical intentions of parody, in my opinion, create a confluence between these three terms, thus making it appropriate to include this description of the social function of satire in this discussion.

[74] Lisa Voigt, in her article "La alegoría de la lectura en Cárcel de Amor," (Crónica 25.2 (1997): 123-133) judges the entire work to be, as the title suggests, an allegory of reading in that the Author is continually reading the events and characters while he simultaneously participates in them, becoming more and more emotionally involved as the story progresses. She believes that this serves the purpose of inviting the reader to participate similarly in the text, to "acercarla a la experiencia vivida, a través de su propia lectura ética" (132).

[75] Scholes and Kellogg characterize the world of romance as one in which "the principal characters in a typical romance are definitely human beings, but extraordinarily attractive ones, and usually virtuous and honorable despite extraordinary pressures. In the romances chastity becomes the most significant of all the virtues. As a rule in these tales, strict poetic justice prevails, and the truly virtuous characters are indestructible though always threatened with destruction" (68-69).

[76] Let us not forget that the tragic ending of Cárcel struck one of its reader as so poetically unjust that he chose to create a continuation in which a semblance of justice is restored.

[77] For example, Hutcheon notes, "[T]his study begins from the same initial assumption—that Cervantes' parodic text is indeed not only the first 'realistic' novel but

also the first self-reflective one…" (4). Alter remarks that the "novel begins out of an erosion of belief in the authority of the written word and it begins with Cervantes" (3). Likewise, Scholes and Kellogg posit that a "new synthesis (between the world of pure romance and the empirical) can be seen clearly in a writer like Cervantes, whose great work is an attempt to reconcile powerful empirical and fictional impulses. From this synthesis he effected, the novel emerges as literary form" (15).

[78] Antonio Pérez-Romero states in his text The Subversive Tradition in Spanish Renaissance Writing (Lewisburg, PA, Bucknell UP: 2005) that "Cárcel de amor (1492) by Diego de San Pedro, was already a modern novel, voicing the same existential problems as the better known La Celestina" (49). Similarly, Carlos Blanco Aguinaga, Julio Rodríguez Puértolas and Iris M. Zavala have voiced the following opinión: "Mas lo importante es que San Pedro, manejando con habilidad todos esos elementos y consiguiendo una auténtica unidad funcional, ha creado algo que no tiene nada que ver con la tradición medieval, algo desconocido hasta el momento en Castilla y que es necesario que llamemos, simplemente, *novela*. [. . .] Al lado todo de una notable sencillez argumental, escasez de aventuras, intimismo e incluso psicologismo. Novela, por lo tanto. Nos encontramos así ante un género literario de nuevo cuño." (Historia social de la literatura Española (en lengua castellana (Madrid: Ediciones Akal, 2000) 190).

[79] We cannot forget that Cárcel was not only published in 20 Spanish editions but was also available in 25 translations. (Keith Whinnom provides these statistics in the

"Noticia Bibliográfica" p.67 of his edition of the novel from which I have cited in this dissertation.)

Works Cited

Alter, Robert. Partial Magic: The Novel as a Self-conscious Genre. Berkely: U of California P, 1975.

Aristotle. Poetics. Trans. Stephen Halliwell. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995.

Baldick, Robert. The Duel: A History of Duelling. London: Hamlin Publishing Group, 1970.

Belmar Marchante, María Angeles. "La tensión de la dicotomía del personaje actor, como acción amorosa y del autor-narrador como ocultamiento: Ardanlier, Arnalte y Leriano." Medioevo y literatura: Actas del V Congreso de la Asociación Hispánica de Literatura Medieval (Granada, 27 septiembre – 1 octubre 1993). Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1995. 311-320.

Blanco Aguinaga, Carlos, Julio Rodríguez Puértolas and Iris M. Zavala. Historia social de la literatura Española en lengua castellana. Madrid: Ediciones Akal, 2000.

Carrillo de Huete, Pero. Abreviación del Halconero. Ms. 434. Biblioteca de Santa Cruz, Universidad de Valladolid.

Castro, Américo. "Algunas observaciones acerca del concepto del honor en los siglos XVI y XVII." RFE 13 (1916): 1-50.

Chorpenning, Joseph F. "Lerano's Consumption of Laureola's Letters in Cárcel de Amor." MLN 95 (1980): 442-445.

---. "Loss of Innocence, Descent into Hell, and Cannibalism: Romance Archetypes and Narrative Unity in Cárcel de Amor." MLR 87 (1992): 342-351.

---. "Rhetoric and Feminism in the Cárcel de Amor." BHS 54 (1977): 1-8.

Dunn, Peter N. "Narrator as Character in the Cárcel de Amor." MLN 94.1 (1979): 187-199.

Elliot, J.H. Imperial Spain: 1469-1716. London: Penguin Group, 1990.

Enríquez del Castillo, Diego. Crónicas de los reyes de Castilla, desde don Alfonso el Sabio hasta los Católicos don Ferdinand y doña Isabel. Ed. Cayetano Rosell. BAE 70. Madrid: Ediciones Atlas, 1953.

Flightener, James. "The Popularity of the Cárcel de Amor." Hispania 47.3 (1964): 475-478.

Gass, William. "Philosophy and the Form of Fiction." Fiction and the Figures of Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.

Gerli, E. Michael. "Leriano's Libation: Notes on the *Cancionero* Lyric, *Ars Moriendi*, and the Probable Debt to Bocaccio." MLN 96 (1981): 414-420.

---. "Metafiction in Spanish Sentimental Romances." *The* Age of the Catholic Monarchs, 1474-1516: Literary Studies in Honor of Keith Whinnom. Eds. Alan Deyermon and Ian Macpherson. Spec.Issue of BHS. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1989: 57-63.

---. "Towards a Poetics of the Spanish Sentimental Romance." Hispania 72 (1989): 474-482.

Green, Otis H. Spain and the Western Tradition. Vol. 1. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963.

Gullón, Ricardo. Galdós, novelista moderno. Madrid: Taurus, 1987.

---. "La historia como material novelable." Benito Pérez Galdós: el escritor y la crítica. Ed. Douglass M. Rogers. Madrid: Taurus, 1973: 403-426.

Howe, Elizabeth Theresa. "A Woman Ensnared: Laureola as Victim in the Cárcel de Amor." REH 21(1987): 13-28.

Huizinga, Johan. The Autumn of the Middle Ages. Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1996.

Hurtado, Juan, and J. de la Serna. Historia de la literatura española. Madrid: Saeta, 1949.

Hutcheon, Linda. Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1980.

Ihrie, Maureen. "Discourses of Power in Cárcel de Amor." Hispanofila 125 (Jan 1999): 1-10.

Kamen, Henry. The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision. London: Yale UP, 1997.

Kellman, Steven. The Self-Begetting Novel. New York: Columbia UP, 1980.

Knight, Stephen. "The Social Function of the Middle English Romances." Medieval Literature: Criticism, Ideology & History. ed. David Aers. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986. 99-122.

Kurta, Barbara. "The Castle Motif and the Medieval Allegory of Love: Diego de San Pedro's Cárcel de Amor." Fifteenth Century Studies 11 (1985): 37-49.

---. "Diego de San Pedro's Cárcel de Amor and the Tradition of the Allegorical Edifice." JHP 8 (1984): 123-138.

Langbehn-Rohland, Regula. Zur Interpretation der Romane des Diego de San Pedro. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1970.

López de Ayala, Pero. Crónicas. Barcelona: Planeta, 1991.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. The Prince and Other Writings. Ed. Wayne A. Rebhorn. New

York: Barnes and Noble Classics, 2003.

Mandrell, James, "Author and Authority in Cárcel de Amor: The Role of El Auctor." JHP 8.2 (1984): 99-122.

Márquez Villanueva, Francisco. Relecciones de literatura medieval. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 1977.

McAleer, Kevin. Dueling: The Cult of Honor in Fin-De-Siècle Germany. (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994)

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. De Cervantes y Lope de Vega. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1964.

Michael, Ian. "Spanish Literature and Learning to 1474." Spain: A Companion to Spanish Studies. Ed. P.E. Russell. London: Methuen, 1973.

Miguel Prendes, Sol. "Las cartas de Cárcel de Amor." Hispanofila 34.3 (1991): 1-22.

Netanyahu, Benzion. The Origins of the Inquisition in Fifteenth Century Spain. New York: New York Review of Books, 2001.

The NIV Study Bible. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Bible Publishers, 1985.

Northrup, George. Introduction to Spanish Literature. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1936.

Oostendorp, Henricus Theodorus. El conflicto entre el honor y el amor en la literature española hasta el siglo XVII. La Haya: Van Goor Zonen, 1962.

Parker, Alexander A. Approach to the Spanish Drama of the Golden Age. London: The Hispanic & Luso-Brazilian Councils, 1957.

---. Literature and the Delinquent: the Picaresque Novel in Spain and Europe 1599-1753. Edinburg: Edinburg UP, 1967.

---. "What is the Spanish Comedia?" The Great Playwrights. Ed. Eric Bentley. New

Cork: Doubleday and Co., 1970. 679-707.

Palencia, Alonso de. Crónica de Enrique IV. BAE 257. Madrid: Ediciones Atlas, 1973.

Parilla, Carmen. Prólogo. Cárcel de Amor. By Diego de San Pedro. Barcelona: Crítica, 1995. xxxvii-lxxxi.

Pérez de Guzmán, Fernán. Crónica del Serenísimo Príncipe Don Juan, Segundo deste nombre en Castilla y en León, escrita por el noble é muy prudente Caballero Fernan Perez de Guzman, Señor de Batres, del su Consejo. Ed. Cayetano Rosell, *BAE* 68. Madrid: Ediciones Atlas, 1953.

Pérez-Romero, Antonio. The Subversive Tradition in Spanish Renaissance Writing. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 2005.

Poema del Mio Cid. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1997.

Pulgar, Fernando del. Claros varones de Castilla. Madrid: Taurus, 1985.

Reyes, Alfonso. "La primera persona narrativa en Diego de San Pedro." BHS 58.2 (1981): 95-102.

Rose, Margaret A. Parody//Meta-Fiction: An Analysis of Parody as a Critical Mirror to the Writing and Reception of Fiction. London: Croom Helm, 1979.

Round, Nicholas. "The Presence of Mosén Diego de Valera in Cárcel de Amor." The Age of the Catholic Monarchs, 1474-1516: Literary Studies in Honor of Keith Whinnom. Eds. Alan Deyermon and Ian Macpherson, Spec.Issue of *BHS*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1989: 144-154.

Reynier, Gustave. Le roman sentimental avant L'Astrée. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1908.

Ripa, Michele. "Ancora sulla fortuna inglese della Cárcel de Amor." Il confronto letterario 27 (1997): 3-27.

San Pedro, Diego de. Obras completas, I: Tractado de amores de Arnalte y Lucenda y el Sermón. Madrid: Castalia, 1973.

---. Obras completas, II: Cárcel de Amor. Ed. Keith Whinnom. Madrid: Castalia, 1971.

---. Obras Completas, III: Poesías. Madrid: Castalia, 1979.

Scholes, Robert and Robert Kellogg. The Nature of Narrative. New York: Oxford UP, 1966.

Severin, Dorothy. "From the Lamentations of Diego de San Pedro to Pleberio's Lament." The Age of the Catholic Monarchs, 1474-1516: Literary Studies in Honor of Keith Whinnom. Eds. Alan Deyermon and Ian Macpherson. Spec.Issue of *BHS* Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1989: 178-184.

---. "Structure and Thematic Repetitions in San Pedro's Cárcel de Amor." Philology Quarterly 31 (1984): 165-169.

Tejerina-Canal, Santiago. "Unidad en Cárcel de Amor: El motivo de la tiranía." Kentucky Romance Quarterly 31 (1984): 51-59.

Ticknor, George. History of Spanish Literature. Vol. 1. New York: Gordion Press, 1965.

Toro, Alfonso de. De las similitudes y diferencias: honor y drama de los siglos XVI y XVII en Italia y España. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 1998.

Torquemada, Antonio de. Colloquios satíricos por Antonio de Torquemada. Orígenes de la novela. Vol. 2 Comp. Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo. Madrid: Bsilly-Bailliére, 1907. 485-581.

Vaca de Osma, José Antonio. Los nobles e innobles validos. Barcelona: Planeta, 1990.

Valbuena Prat, Angel. Historia de la literatura española. Tomo 1. Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, 1956.

---. Historia del teatro español. Barcelona: Editorial Noguer, 1956.

Valera, Diego de. Crónica de los Reyes Católicos. Añejo. Spec. Issue of RFE Sup. 7-8 (1925): 1-306.

---. Memorial de diversas hazañas. BAE 70. Madrid: Ediciones Atlas, 1953.

---. Memorial de diversas hazañas. Ed. Juan de Mata Carriazo. Madrid: Espasa-Calpa, 1941.

Vicente, Luis Miguel. "El lamento de Pleberio: Contraste y parecido con dos lamentos en Cárcel de Amor." Celestinesca 12 (1988): 35-43.

Voigt, Lisa. "La alegoría de la lectura en Cárcel de Amor." Crónica 25.2 (1997): 123-133.

Von Richthofen, Erich. "Petrarca, Dante y Antreas Capellanus: Fuentes inadvertidas de La Cárcel de Amor." Revista canadiense de estudios hispánicos 1 (1976): 30-38.

Waley, Pamela. "Love and Honour in the Novelas Sentimentales of Diego de San Pedro and Juan de Flores." BHS 43.4 (1966): 253-275.

Wardropper, Bruce W. "Allegory and the Role of *El Autor* in the Cárcel de Amor." Philological Quarterly 31.1 (1952): 39-44.

---. "El mundo sentimental de la Cárcel de Amor." RFE 37 (1953): 168-193.

Waugh, Patricia. Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-conscious Fiction. New York: Metheun, 1984.

Weissberrger, Barbara. “The Politics of Cárcel de Amor.” Revista de estudios hispánicos 26 (1992): 307-326.

Whinnom, Keith. Diego de San Pedro. New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1974.

---. “Diego de San Pedro’s Stylistic Reform.” BHS 37 (1960): 1-15.

---. Introduction. Obras completas I: Tractado de amores de Arnalte y Lucenda y el Sermón. By Diego de San Pedro. Madrid: Clásicos Castalia, 1973. 1-97.

---. Noticia bibliográfica. Obras completas II: Cárcel de Amor. By Diego de San Pedro. Madrid: Clásicos Castalia, 1971. 67-70.

---. “The Problem of the ‘Best-seller’ in Spanish Golden-Age Literature.” BHS 58 (1980): 189-198.

---. “Two San Pedros.” BHS 42 (1965): 255-258.

Zimic, Stanislav. El pensamiento humanístico y satírico de Torres Naharro. Santander:

## VITA

Amy Denise Schreiber was born in Dallas, Texas on January 14, 1970, the daughter of Diana Gail Humphries and James Richard Grant III. After graduating from J.J. Pearce High School in Richardson, Texas, she entered Baylor University in Waco, Texas. She received the degree of Bachelor of Science from Baylor University in December 1992. For the next six years she worked as a Spanish language teacher in Plano ISD. During that time she completed a Master of Arts degree in Santiago de Compostela, Spain through the University of Northern Iowa. In September, 1999 she entered the Graduate School of The University of Texas at Austin.

Permanent Address: 114 San Mateo Court, Allen, Texas, 75013

This dissertation was typed by the author.